Foreign Broadcast Information Service 50 ANNIVERSARY 1941 - 1991

Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-123
Wednesday
26 June 1991

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-123 *26 June 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: • indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ALBANIA

Corruption of Former Durres Leaders Exposed *[ZERI I POPULLIT 18 Jun]* 1
Trade Unions Urge Rapid Resolution of Demands *[Tirana Radio]* 2
Reportage on Pashko Brussels EC Visit 2
Meets With EC's Andriessen *[ATA]* 2
Hosted by U.S. Mission to EC *[ATA]* 2
Foreign Trade Minister Cabiri Visits Athens *[ATA]* 3

BULGARIA

Popov Presses for Passage of Reform Legislation *[Sofia Radio]* 4
BSP Resolution on New Constitution *[DUMA 21 Jun]* 4
MP's Claim BSP 'Threatened by Disintegration' *[BTA]* 5
BSP Legislators Reportedly Leave Party *[BTA]* 5
DUMA Accused of 'Misquoting' President Zhelev *[BTA]* 5
Recent Political Developments Surveyed *[BTA]* 6
Agriculture Minister Interviewed on U.S. Visit *[DEMOKRATSIYA 20 Jun]* 7
Farmers Protest at Agriculture Ministry *[BTA]* 7
IMF To Help Revise Tax System *[BTA]* 8
Todorov 'Skeptical' About Relations With Turkey *[BTA]* 8

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Spokesman Says SFRY Undergoing 'Reconstruction' *[CTK]* 9
Soviet General Discusses Troop Withdrawal *[CTK]* 9
Havel Thanks USSR General for Cooperation *[CTK]* 9
Treaty Coordination With USSR Discussed *[CTK]* 10
Rychetsky Says Moscow Cannot Pay Back Debts *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 25 Jun]* 10
Industry Minister on Iranian Oil Deal *[CTK]* 10
Pithart Rejects Sudeten German Proposal *[CTK]* 11
Environmental Cooperation Agreement Signed *[CTK]* 11
Klaus Says 1990 Economic Development Positive *[CTK]* 11
Slovak Council Approves Resolution on Screening *[CTK]* 11
Slovak Government Holds Session in Bratislava *[NARODNA OBRODA 20 Jun]* 11
Carnogursky on State Treaty, Slovak Issues *[SVOBODNE SLOVO 21 Jun]* 12
KDH Adopts Resolution on State Arrangement *[SLOVENSKY DENNIK 24 Jun]* 13
Young Democratic Left Organization Established *[Bratislava PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 14
Czech National Council Appoints Control Minister *[Prague Radio]* 14

HUNGARY

Talks With USSR on Troop Withdrawal End 15
No Protocol Signed *[MTI]* 15
Antall, Fur on Talks *[Budapest TV]* 15
Goncz Letter to Gorbachev *[MTI]* 18
Antall on Sovereignty *[MAGYAR NEMZET 22 Jun]* 18
Labor Minister on Moonlighting, Unemployment *[NEPSZAVA 21 Jun]* 20
Foreign Minister Jeszenszky on CSCE Results *[Budapest Radio]* 21
Jeszensky on Independence, SFRY Conflict *[MTI]* 22

POLAND

Walesa Signs Senate Electoral Law *[PAP]* 23
Walesa Visits Precision Tools Factory *[PAP]* 23
Remarks on Dissolving Sejm *[Warsaw TV]* 23
On Retribution, Moscow Trip *[Warsaw TV]* 23
Defense Vice Minister on Links With USSR *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 19 Jun]* 25
Interior Minister on Covert Operations *[SZTANDAR MLODYCH 21-23 Jun]* 27

ROMANIA

Territorial Claims on Bulgaria Denied *[ROMPRES]* 29
Press on Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact Statement *[ROMPRES]* 29
Leadership Strategy on 'Parallel' Parties Noted *[DREPTATEA 20 Jun]* 29
UDMR Sees 'Territorial Integrity' Threatened *[ROMPRES]* 30
'Exclusive' Interview With Former King Mihai *[ROMANIA LIBERA 18 Jun]* 30
SRI Chief Interviewed on Berevoiesti Case *[LIBERTATEA 17-18 Jun]* 32
Roman Addresses Meeting on Danube Cooperation *[ROMPRES]* 34
Prime Minister Addresses World Bank Seminar *[ROMPRES]* 35
President Iliescu Interviewed by Soviet Weekly *[ROMPRES]* 35

YUGOSLAVIA

Croatian Assembly Proclaims Independence *[AFP]* 36
Declaration on Croatian Autonomy Cited *[TANJUG]* 36
Croatian Declaration Defines 'State Borders' *[TANJUG]* 36
Croatian President's Independence Speech *[Zagreb Radio]* 36
More on Slovene Declaration of Independence *[TANJUG]* 42
Kucan Lists Principles for Slovene Cooperation *[TANJUG]* 43
Kucan States Independence Not Devoid of Risk *[TANJUG]* 43
FEC Declares Secessions 'Null and Void' *[TANJUG]* 43
Federal Chamber Assails 'Unilateral Secession' *[TANJUG]* 44
Federal Chamber Adopts Conclusions on Slovenia *[Belgrade TV]* 44
Federal Chamber Conclusions on Crisis Solution *[Belgrade Radio]* 44
Chamber To Ask FEC To Protect Sovereignty *[TANJUG]* 46
Compromise Proposals 'Solid Basis' for Talks *[TANJUG]* 46
Federal State To 'Take Over' Slovene Borders *[TANJUG]* 46
Chamber Claims 'Duty' To Prevent 'Changes' *[TANJUG]* 47
Kostic on Croatian Sovereignty Declaration *[TANJUG]* 47
Republics Warned of Nation's Economic Isolation *[TANJUG]* 47
UK Calls For 'Peaceful Dialogue' on Crisis *[TANJUG]* 47
Genscher, De Michelis Stress State Integrity *[TANJUG]* 47
France's Dumas Said To Warn Against 'Explosion' *[TANJUG]* 48
Situation Tense on Italian Border *[TANJUG]* 48
Army Arriving at Kranjska Gora Border Crossing *[TANJUG]* 48
Tudjman: Bulgaria Recognizes Independence *[Zagreb Radio]* 48
Bulgaria Denies Recognition *[TANJUG]* 49
Conflicting Statements Reported on Croatia *[TANJUG]* 49
Zagreb Weekly on 'Inviolable Rulers' of Croatia *[TANJUG]* 49
Croatia Decision Termed Invalid in Serbian Regions *[TANJUG]* 49
Serb Areas in Croatia To Stay in Common State *[Belgrade Radio]* 50
Zagreb Radio Announces Croatian Charter 50
Full Mobilization Reported in Dvor na Uni *[Belgrade Radio]* 50
Dead, Injured Reported in Krajina Shooting *[TANJUG]* 51
Soldiers Surround Kuzma Border Crossing, Withdraw *[Zagreb Radio]* 51
Tanks Reportedly Heading for Glina, Croatia *[Zagreb Radio]* 51
Belgrade, Zagreb Press Views Markovic Speech *[TANJUG]* 51
Loncar Attends Croatian Assembly, Meets Press *[Zagreb Radio]* 52
Croatian TV Reports Shots Fired in Kozibrod *[TANJUG]* 53
Croatia Recognizes Federal Army as Interim Force *[TANJUG]* 53
Army 'Cannot Operate' in Croatia *[TANJUG]* 53

Croatian Assembly Recognizes Slovenia *[TANJUG]* 54
TANJUG Explains Slovene Independence Acts 54
Slovene Leaders On Immediate Independence Tasks *[TANJUG]* 54
Slovenia to Seek International Recognition *[TANJUG]* 55
Kucan: Talks Possible After Independence *[Ljubljana Radio]* 55
Bucar, Peterle Hold News Conference *[Ljubljana Radio]* 55
Bucar Terms Federal Reaction 'Neurotic' *[TANJUG]* 56
Bucar Sends Congratulations to Croatia *[Ljubljana Radio]* 57
Slovene Paper on Markovic's Speech *[TANJUG]* 57
Slovene Officials Clarify Army Role, Customs *[TANJUG]* 57
FEC Orders Collection of Customs From Slovenia *[Ljubljana Radio]* 57
DELO: World 'Pushing Slovenia Back Home' *[TANJUG]* 58
Gligorov Views Slovene, Croatian 'Secession' *[TANJUG]* 58
Krajina President Comments on Croatian Secession *[TANJUG]* 58

Corruption of Former Durres Leaders Exposed

AU2506110091 Tirana ZERI I POPULLIT in Albanian 18 Jun 91 p 1

[Sotiraq Gjordeni article: "A More Thorough Analysis of Corruption"]

[Text] The leaders of the Durres Party Committee, former Politburo members and candidate members whom the congress expelled from the party for well-known reasons, are also guilty of other things before the people and the Durres party organization. They "reigned" at whim in Durres, creating their cults and estates. The demand for further analysis of their cases is therefore just, so that the party may entirely purge itself of the degenerate elements that gathered around these leaders and became their sidekicks and fools. This stems from the necessity of purging the party thoroughly, so that the new socialist party with its new ideological platform and organization can be one of the country's main political forces, with the people's full trust.

The alienation from the masses in Durres, one of the most serious mistakes of the party committee apparatus, did not happen overnight. It developed gradually. The masses talked, and party members raised their voices, but the "idols," the "party's loyal soldiers," remained in their shell. Muho Asllani made a good start in Durres by building a few apartments, but only to create a good personal image and to found his petit bourgeois "empire": I am here; I am the savior; I sign and seal; any opposition to me costs a person dearly. This very harmful tendency was encouraged in him by a number of servile and rotten apparatchiks, devoid of all personality. The Durres Party Committee almost became a fortress at whose gate people had to knock, and knock hard several times, before succeeding or not in meeting one of its secretaries. Whenever they managed to meet a secretary, they often came away disappointed. Whenever it happened that the people asked to meet a secretary, the secretaries would turn tail and send some instructors in their places. Time and again, the order was issued to close the committee's doors, and party employees and cadres with various problems could hardly gain entry.

The people had many worries. They raised them at meetings and party members also supported them, but privileges for the leading party minority in Durres only grew. The petit bourgeois atmosphere spread to the point that the first secretaries distributed color television sets. When they felt inclined, they did "good deeds," but not without remuneration. The excuses we heard at the congress from Muho Asllani and Qirjako Mihali are disgusting. The people of Durres and the district's party organization knew that there was a hunting preserve in Durres District, near Sukth, where nobody but "the party's loyal soldiers" ever set foot. Gunfire was heard, and it is said even automatic rifle fire, as in wartime, and dozens and dozens of pheasants and other birds fell. What became of these poor victims? Some agricultural cooperatives became nothing less than estates. Like brigands, the principal party leaders and the district leaders were secretly supplied with meat and all the good things of life. The people knew these things very well, and talked, but for the party bureaucrats this was rumor-mongering. Party members raised their voices, but these people, to the bureaucrats, were "quarrelers" who harmed unity. Qirjako Mihali even postponed bureau meetings or rushed through them because they ate into his precious time for fishing, and he did not go fishing only on Sundays, but every day. Everybody saw this. He must also have heard what was said in Durres, that his motorboat often left territorial waters, bringing border guards to remind him to turn back. The district party leaders heard that the people said that even their wives carried out cadre policy. Muho Asllani also knows well that he laid down the law even in the justice services, and nobody dared to oppose him. Thus, he convicted whomever he pleased and also closed the files when he pleased, as happened in the case of the export truck fleet, in which many corrupt party cadres in the district and centrally were implicated. The people know that Qirjako Mihali lied when his car, driven not by his chauffeur but his son, turned over on the railroad tracks at Sukth and a big demijohn full of brandy was spilled. When the question of an investigation arose, he had no compunction about hiding the facts. There is no end to the amazing things done by such former leaders who cheated the party and the people and seriously damaged the party's image.

Durres became another powerful residential compound, from the big villas on the hill, where the party's former top leadership went to live like kings, to the leaders' beach villas, where they spent millions on luxury and food, surrounded by metal fencing and soldiers, as if they lived on another planet and not among the people. Other brownnosers moved in these circles, various former secretaries of the party committee, and even certain instructors who moved whenever they felt inclined. There was a proverbial expression in Durres: "A new secretary, a new house." And what houses, with two or more entrances, on which the brigades of the communal sector worked for weeks and months with the most expensive materials, some imported, and some taken from the tourist sector. After all, these gentlemen needed quiet surroundings to sit by their firesides and think more clearly and creatively for the good of the people.

Feudal lords of this kind, who could be called anything but secretaries, will be held responsible without fail following analyses to be carried out by party organizations. They will be held accountable not only for these but for other things. They appointed whomever they wanted as managers. One bastion of the incompetent in Durres is famous: The Material and Technical Supply Enterprise, in which many incompetent managers vegetated like pashas. They must answer for their negative attitude to the splendid intelligentsia of Durres, whom the patriarchs wanted to turn into robots. These former leaders and other apparatchiks must answer for the lies they told their superiors, artificially embellishing the real situation, and hiding failures. Whenever criticism

appeared in the press, they turned their entire arsenal against the authors of the articles, accusing them of slinging mud at the party's work in Durres, and blaming them for the shortfalls and other negative phenomena. Many incompetent and despicable elements accumulated in the party apparatus, and drew their salaries only for receiving bribes and for behind-the-scenes intrigue and skulduggery. Later, when they left the apparatus, they assumed privileged positions because of their "major contributions." These, too, must be called to account, because they did serious harm to the party's image. It was these people who did this harm, not the many thousands of ordinary party members. The analyses must be carried out quickly. The thorough renewal of the new Socialist Party begins at the grass roots. The party's total dissociation from the bitter past began at the 10th Congress and will be completed quickly, especially at the grass roots level. The Socialist Party cannot include such elements. Without them, it will become stronger, purer, fresher, more honest, more progressive, and more loved by the people, and that is what will happen without fail.

Trade Unions Urge Rapid Resolution of Demands

AU2506195891 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 1800 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] A statement by the Union of Independent Trade Unions [BSPSh] states that the entire public has now been informed of the agreement signed between the government and the BSPSh on the fulfillment of the 17 demands presented by the BSPSh.

All these demands were met. However, item 14 of this agreement accepts that the Council of Ministers promised to give full authority to the respective ministries for resolving the specific demands of certain branches such as mining, the chemical industry, metallurgy, the food industry, etc.

At the meeting of the Council of Ministers on 17 June 1991, the BSPSh also stressed that the 15 percent wage increase for workers in mines did not correspond to the wage increases in other branches of the economy. The government should therefore reconsider its attitude on this point.

The BSPSh, the declaration continues, once again calls on the ministries to end as soon as possible their bureaucratic practice of procrastination, because the fastest possible solution to these specific problems is a condition for the preservation of the social peace in which we are now all interested and to which we are committed.

Reportage on Pashko Brussels EC Visit

Meets With EC's Andriessen

AU2406202591 Tirana ATA in English 1806 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Tirana, June 24 (ATA)—On June 24, at the seat of the European Community in Brussels, the vice-premier and minister of the economy, Gramoz Pashko, met with the deputy chairman of the European Community Commission, Frans Andriessen. They exchanged views on the development of the relations and possibilities of economic cooperation between Albania and the European Community in various fields of mutual interest.

The Vice-Premier Pashko spoke on the economic programme of the National Stability Government and the efforts made to overcome the economic crisis. He dwelt at length on the package of economic reforms drafted in the framework of Albania's economic transition to a market economy. Dr. Gramoz Pashko hailed the decision of the European Community for the establishment of diplomatic relations with Albania and pointed to the importance our country attaches to the relations and economic cooperation with the European Community. Then the vice-premier spoke on the creation of the legal cadre to guarantee the investments and interests of the foreign firms and countries in Albania.

The deputy chairman of the European Community Commission, Frans Andriessen, after congratulating the establishment of the diplomatic relations between Albania and the European Community, aired his readiness to help Albania realize its ambitious program of economic reforms. He said that the European Community will study soon the needs and conditions of the Albanian economy and will examine the possibilities of reaching an agreement of economic-trade cooperation between Albania and the European Community. Frans Andriessen stated that the work contacts for this economic-trade cooperation between Albania and European Community will start since today with the meetings of the Albanian vice-premier with the top officials and specialized organisms of the community. Regarding the problem of the humanitarian aids, the deputy chairman of the Commission said that the European Community has decided to send them to Albania soon. At the same time, he underlined that the European Community will cooperate and coordinate also with the other international institutions, the IMF, World Bank, etc., regarding the aid to be granted to Albania for the application of the reforms toward market economy.

The Vice-Premier Gramoz Pashko and the deputy chairman of the European Community Commission, Frans Andriessen, exchanged views also on issues of the international situation, of the situation in Yugoslavia and in the Balkans, and on other political problems. The meeting decided that in July a fact-gathering mission of the European Community as well as a commission of the Group 2, will come to Albania to help improve the balance sheet of payments.

Hosted by U.S. Mission to EC

AU2406202691 Tirana ATA in English 1816 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Tirana, June 24 (ATA)—The charge d'affaires of the U.S. Mission to the European Community, Thomas Weston, gave a dinner in Brussels in honor of the

Albanian vice-premier, Gramoz Pashko, who is there on an official visit at the invitation of the European Community Commission. Attending the dinner was also the head of the Foreign Relations General Department of the European Community Commission, Pablo Benavides; the member of the cabinet at the Community Commission, Michael Leigh; the chiefs of departments at the Commission, Maslen and de Lange, and other senior officials of the European Community. During dinner views were exchanged on the materialization of the cooperation between Albania and the European Community, on various forms of the aid by the Community to realise the present programme of democratic reforms in Albania, on problems of the situation in the Balkans and in Europe, etc.

Foreign Trade Minister Cabiri Visits Athens

AU2506135291 Tirana ATA in English 1020 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Tirana, June 25 (ATA)—The minister of foreign economic relations, Ylli Cabiri, paid a one-day working visit to Greece. He met and had talks with the deputy minister of trade, Sotirios Khatzigakis, on the possibilities and ways to enlarge the economic cooperation between the two countries and to enhance the level of trade exchanges. Opinions were also exchanged on the possibility of reaching a bilateral agreement for the mutual defense of investments, the coming meeting of the Joint Commission of Economic Cooperation, as well as on the possibility of creating custom facilities and of the cross-border trade. The minister Khatzigakis underscored the desire and readiness of the Greek party to undertake concrete measures on the expansion of cooperation. At the end the two ministers signed the memorandum on the credit to the tune of 20 million dollars that Greece has accorded Albania. Attending the signing ceremony were functionaries of the Ministry of Trade, members of the Albanian delegation, as well as representatives of the Greek press and television. Present was also the ambassador of the Republic of Albania in Athens, Izedin Hajdini.

The respective bank agreement between the Albanian State Bank and the group of six Greek banks was signed.

During his stay in Athens, the minister Ylli Cabiri had separate meetings with the minister of transports and telecommunications, N. Gelestathis, the deputy minister of environment and public works, A. Karamanlis, the secretary general of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, P. Ikonomou.

During these meetings, opinions were exchanged on concrete projects of investments.

Popov Presses for Passage of Reform Legislation

AU2506110491 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1000 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Ilyana Yancheva report from the National Assembly building in Sofia—live]

[Text] The Bureau of the Grand National Assembly and the Council of Ministers issued the following announcement this morning.

Prime Minister Mr. Dimitur Popov, Deputy Prime Minister Dimitur Ludzhev, and other ministers and officials of the Council of Ministers held a meeting with the leadership of the Grand National Assembly and representatives of the different parliamentary commissions on 25 June. They stressed once again the need for the legislature, in addition to working on adopting the constitution, to discuss and approve by vote the most urgent laws connected with speeding up the economic and social reform in the country. Most important in this context are the bills on forming and reforming state companies, updating the 1991 state budget, privatization, banking, the taxation system, the environment, and so on.

The prime minister insisted that the examination of these and other draft laws should be speeded up, bearing in mind the need for a stable legislative basis for the government's actions, as well as the government's relations with the European and other international institutions.

BSP Resolution on New Constitution

AU2606005591 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 21 Jun 91 pp 1, 3

["Resolution of the BSP Supreme Council on the Work of the Seventh Grand National Assembly and Adoption of a New Constitution," adopted at BSP Supreme Council meeting in Sofia on 16 June]

[Text] For one year already, the Grand National Assembly, the only organ of state power directly elected by the people, has been the mainstay of a peaceful transition toward a democratic society. At the National Round Table, the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] adopted the idea for its election, acting on the conviction that the country needed a fundamental reform of its political and economic systems; a new constitution which guaranteed the rights and freedoms of every citizen, political pluralism, and the division of power; and new economic legislation—the basis for advancing to a market economy. The need for a Grand National Assembly was categorically confirmed by the mass participation of voters and political forces in the June 1990 free and democratic elections.

Despite political polarization in society, the Assembly managed to adopt laws that initiated change in the economic system, prepared and adopted at first reading the draft constitution, which corresponds to all modern democratic requirements, and even reached agreement on such difficult questions as the election of a president and government. The BSP's legislative majority, the socialist MP's, made a decisive contribution to this. With its legislative actions so far, the Grand National Assembly has disproved those groundless convictions that, with its present membership, it is not in a position to adopt democratic laws and a constitution. This is recognized abroad but contested by some Bulgarian politicians.

From the very start, beginning right after the elections, the Grand National Assembly's activities were placed under constant great pressure. A noisy and aggressive minority, affiliated to a part of the opposition, refused to accept the people's vote, and as a consequence, with its actions in and outside of the legislature, hampered the supreme legislative organ's activities. The public can hardly have forgotten the numerous declarations, calls, sit-ins, human cordons, strikes, attacks against MP's, and other "legislative" and non-legislative acts that continually distracted the Grand National Assembly from its immediate duties.

During the last few weeks pressure on the Grand National Assembly has grown. In violation of their legal and moral duties, MP's from different parliamentary factions have walked out of parliament. From time to time new ultimatums for walk-outs resound from its rostrum. The very necessity of the Grand National Assembly's existence and of the adoption of a new constitution began to be contested. All this, from the same people who energetically convinced us early last year that the most direct route to democracy was through a Constituent or Grand National Assembly. Those who constantly talk about "changing the system" now want to impress on us that this can be done without a new constitution and without the legislature. The opponents of the Grand National Assembly and the new constitution want to dissolve the legislature because they know that the adoption of a new, democratic and modern fundamental law for this country from this legislature, with this majority, will be the most striking evidence of the Socialist Party's adherence to democratic values.

The BSP has never changed its stance: The Grand National Assembly must fulfill its function. It must adopt the constitution and also the fundamental laws that guarantee the further progress of the economic reform. Any other variant would be disregarding the will of the voters, would threaten civic peace, and would stop the development of democracy and hinder the country's escape from economic crisis. The BSP believes that the Grand National Assembly's MP's will be held responsible by the people and history if they do not create preconditions for the irreversibility of the peaceful transition to democracy and do not oppose attempts to establish a new totalitarianism.

The aims of those who oppose, at all costs, the adoption of the new constitution are no longer hidden. They are openly contesting centuries-old principles of law and

universally accepted norms of democratic life recognized in all international pacts on human rights, including the inadmissibility of pursuing retroactive laws for political purposes or violating people's property. It is already absolutely clear that the extreme right forces are aiming at a state of anarchy, arbitrary rule and the constant setting of people against another. They hope to gain control even before the elections and use it to defeat their opponents, to oust the BSP from political life by force and to heap on it full responsibility for all the difficulties and mistakes of the transitional stage.

It is the BSP Supreme Council's duty to confide its great concern to the party and public at large over this dangerous and irresponsible script. Its implementation would have extremely serious consequences for Bulgaria's fragile democracy. Civic peace is always in danger when real legislative power, strong constitutional guarantees of the people's rights, normal conditions for the functioning of a civil society and the institutions of power are absent.

It is still not too late to thwart this script. To do this, the new constitution must be adopted. This is presently the most urgent and important task of the Socialist Party and its parliamentary faction. The BSP calls on all those who cherish democracy and feel responsible for Bulgaria's future to openly express their civic position and use their rights by law to achieve this highly patriotic aim.

The socialist MP's will fulfill their supreme political and civic duty and be signatories to the final text of the constitution in Veliko Turnovo—cradle of the first Bulgarian Constitution. At this solemn occasion, let all the MP's from different political forces stand side by side, as was the case more than a hundred years ago, united by their responsibilty to Bulgaria. Thus, the Seventh Grand National Assembly will fulfill its most important mission.

BSP Supreme Council

MP's Claim BSP 'Threatened by Disintegration'

AU2506091191 Sofia BTA in English 0654 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 25 (BTA)—The BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] is threatened by organizational and ideological disintegration, the party is in foreign and internal political isolation and the problem about its nature—social democratic or communist—remains unsolved. This is the opinion of the parliamentary groups "Europe' [as received] Social Democratic Platform" and "MP's for national accord," quoted by today's "DEBATI."

The party is threatened by intellectual anaemia, its influence among workers is waning and it seems to have no influence among young people in general. This increases the impression of futurelessness, the two Socialist groups assert.

It is their categorical opinion that the solution of the fundamental problems facing the party in the new conditions requires the holding of an extraordinary congress prior to the elections.

When they put forward their stand at the June 15-16 meeting of the Supreme Council of the BSP, the meeting adopted a resolution to hold the congress after the elections, and to convene a national conference in August before the elections.

At the series of press conferences which followed, the BSP's leaders neglected this document. The statements of Mr. Aleksandur Lilov implied that the radicals' opinion is part of the "exceptionally active and democratic debates." In a radio interview last Sunday his deputy, Mr. Andrey Lukanov, described this stand as "interesting." In his opinion, it should be given publicity.

BSP Legislators Reportedly Leave Party

AU2506165191 Sofia BTA in English 1614 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 25 (BTA)—Twelve MP's of the parliamentary faction of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) have not re-registered as members of the party, Mr. Petur Balabanov, deputy floor leader of the BSP, told the press today. In this way he denied a statement made by Socialist Manol Manolov for "DEMOKRATSIYA," who claimed that 100 MP's of the BSP had not re-registered. Each case is specific, Mr. Balabanov said. None of the twelve has renounced the BSP election platform.

Later on, however, Mr. Balabanov told the BTA he could not identify all twelve MP's. He only named Radical Dragomir Draganov, Matushka Avramova (who declared that she was member of the Alternative Socialist Organization outside the BSP as early as last year), and actor Vasil Mikhaylov (who became a member of the Communist Party). BSP member Todor Todorov, son of Ivan Todorov- Gorunya who was killed in the 60's for conspiring against Todor Zhivkov, left the BSP faction about half a year ago. Mr. Balabanov also mentioned off the record Astronaut Georgi Ivanov and philosopher Petur-Emil Mitev.

Mr. Manolov, who intends to leave the Socialist Party, says in "DEMOKRATSIYA" that painter Svetlin Rusev, poet Valeri Petrov, writer Rudenko Yordanov and Stefan Staynov will also leave the party. At their regular press conference today the Socialists stressed that Mr. Manolov had made his statement for "DEMOKRATSIYA" "in a bar, after a few glasses of brandy."

DUMA Accused of 'Misquoting' President Zhelev

AU2606011291 Sofia BTA in English 1957 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 25 (BTA)—"DUMA," the daily of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP), put in President Zhelev's

mouth words which he did not say at the National Conference of the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) on Saturday. The SDS argues that this is manipulation.

Today's "DUMA" ran excerpts from speeches made at the conference. More than half of the speech attributed to President Zhelev is not his. The SDS Press Centre says that the three paragraphs attributed to Dr. Zhelev "damage his prestige as president." According to "DUMA," Dr. Zhelev said that it is up to the MP's' individual conscience whether they will remain in parliament or walk out of it. This comes at a moment when some 70 MP's are boycotting parliament and the issue of parliament's self-dissolution has been raised with great urgency.

The SDS believes that the "DUMA" editors will try to excuse themselves saying that this is a misprint or technical error. The denial issued by the SDS Press Centre says that "these errors in this newspaper are not accidental. Dr. Zhelev's speech was recorded on tape and a full transcript immediately made available to the journalists covering the conference on Saturday. The president did not utter the three paragraphs in question."

So far there has been no comment on the case from the Office of the President.

Recent Political Developments Surveyed

AU2506201491 Sofia BTA in English 1858 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 25 (BTA)—Today the Grand National Assembly continued its second-reading debate on the draft constitution, passing one of the last chapters, on local self-government. Parliament opened the discussion on the Environmental Protection Bill. The MP's approved the draft of the protocol on the dissolution of the CMEA.

At a meeting with the leadership of the Bulgarian Parliament and with members of the parliamentary committees, Prime Minister Dimitur Popov insisted that the Grand National Assembly expedite the discussion of some bills which are of paramount importance for the economic reform: draft legislation on the establishment and transformation of state companies, on the 1991 budget update, on privatization, on banking and on taxation.

The constitution would hardly be passed if more MP's walk out of parliament. Their number has reached nearly 70 now, but on the other hand a new Electoral Bill can be carried, the press were told at a regular BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] press conference today. Political talks are already underway on the principles of the bill, the lawyer Mr. Velko Vulkanov MP of the Bulgarian Socialist Party said.

At today's press briefing of the parliamentary Union of Democratic Forces (SDS), the SDS MP's who stayed in parliament demanded that the "no-confidence" passed on them by the SDS National Coordinating Council and its local branches be revoked. In a special statement the parliamentary SDS calls on the SDS-affiliated parties and organizations to consider a draft election platform and a draft agreement between them.

It has emerged that representatives of the Italian judiciary and the Italian investigating authorities which have reopened the inquiry into the 1981 attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II will arrive in Sofia tomorrow. Their visit follows a publication in the Italian "IL GIORNO" daily which quoted former employees of the Bulgarian Secret Services as saying that the Soviet KGB was involved in the shooting plot. President Zhelyu Zhelev has already declared Bulgaria's readiness to assist the Italian investigating magistrates.

Today nearly 2,000 letters from foreigners were discovered by chance alongside a road leading to a village in the district of Aytos (Burgas region). The letters were opened. Many of the envelopes contained entry visas and formal invitations sent from West European countries, Australia and the United States. The letters are dated April-June 1991. According to the statement of the local post master, the letters did not reach his post office. The case will be investigated by the Regional Police Department.

Bulgarian books (written by Bulgarians from Vardar Macedonia) and newspapers ("MAKEDONIA" and "ZORA") were seized at the Novo Selo checkpoint (the Republic of Macedonia) from Ilija Ilievski, chairman of the Human Rights Party in Macedonia, on June 22, when he was on his way back from a visit to Bulgaria, the BTA correspondent in Belgrade reported today.

After Prime Minister Dimitur Popov cut short his visit to Liechtenstein yesterday, the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a declaration describing the unilateral inclusion on the part of Liechtenstein of a participation of Simeon Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, presented as "Tsar of the Bulgarians," in the schedule of the visit and the official dinner as "an act of political provocation and an unprovoked unfriendly gesture." Today a BTA reporter was assured by the office of Simeon II in Madrid that tomorrow he would take a stand on the matter.

The Bulgarian Agrarian Party (BZNS) gives its unqualified support to Agriculture and Food Processing Minister Boris Spirov and his policy seeking to promote private farming, the land reform and the application of a new, market-based approach in agriculture, it was announced here today after yesterday's demonstration with "a political undertones seeking to discredit the agricultural policy of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party." The Agrarians see the protest action as an attempt to attack the ministries in charge of the country's economy which are headed by representatives of the SDS and the BZNS, a leader of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party pointed out today.

A Child and Nature Foundation was set up in Sofia today.

Agriculture Minister Interviewed on U.S. Visit

AU2506145591 Sofia DEMOKRATSIYA in Bulgarian 20 Jun 91 p 2

[Interview with Boris Spirov, minister of agriculture and food industry, by Diana Vancheva; place and date not given: "They Cannot Forgive Me for Supporting Private Agriculture"]

[Text] [Vancheva] What did you bring home for Bulgarian agriculture from your U.S. visit?

[Spirov] I attach prime importance to my meetings in the Department of Agriculture, which invited me to visit the United States at its expense. Assistant Agriculture Secretary Gardner introduced me to the man who will work for us in the long term on the problems of privatization in agriculture and the food industry. His name is Mr. Ran Mikoff. Private farming and privatization were the topics that constantly came up in my talks in the United States, and some people in Bulgaria cannot forgive me for this. Mr. Mikoff will arrive in Bulgaria on 1 July to familiarize himself with the situation and will assume his permanent posting here as of 1 August.

American consultants will visit Bulgaria, entirely at U.S. expense, I should add. We will not provide a single cent, but we will receive quite a lot from them. All the interested specialists and official departments will be able to consult them.

The Scientific Services Section of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which has already gained much experience in cooperation with Poland, can quickly send a team to Bulgaria, because our expertise in this field is very poor. The first task envisaged is to set up regional branches. The specialists serving in these branches will show how private agriculture will be served and how they will earn their salaries from the state budget.

I learned from Ms. Veneman, U. S. first deputy under secretary of agriculture, that the department is ready to send its agricultural attache for the Balkans on permanent assignment to Sofia. At the moment he is in Belgrade. This will shift the center of gravity to Bulgaria. We agreed that the Americans would set up three companies in Bulgaria with their own funds for the production of pigs, vegetables, and wheat. The managers responsible for these projects will arrive at the end of June.

We arranged with the VOCA [Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance] organization, which has been set up to help foreign cooperatives, to provide 150 experts for a three-year period to help us to set up private cooperatives. I did all this because the resistance to private farming in Bulgaria is terrible. Before the end of June, the first team will arrive from the World Bank to work on granting loans to Bulgarian agriculture. I learned from the Agency for International Development that Bulgaria is the fourth most important partner after Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

[Vancheva] The draft decree for encouraging agriculture has already been prepared by your ministry and submitted to the government. What proposals does it contain?

[Spirov] It asks for preferential interest rates to be granted for agricultural credits, as well as for the suspension of taxes for five years, but I fear that other sectors are also hastening to get on this bandwagon. Nonetheless, a tax moratorium for agriculture is essential.

Farmers Protest at Agriculture Ministry

AU2506095691 Sofia BTA in English 2039 GMT 24 Jun 91

[From BTA review of events of 24 June]

[Text] Sofia, June 24 (BTA)—At a rally in front of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Processing Industry today several hundred farmers from all parts of the country demanded the resignation of Minister of Agriculture Mr. Spirov and insisted that the government shortly adopt a decree on the development of this branch.

This rally was organized at harvest-time by the Federation of Independent Farmers' Trade Unions and the national strike committee of the branch. It came after 45 years of communist rule which reduced the arable land by 140,000 hectares. The farming machinery is Soviet-made, the combine harvesters waste one fifth of the yield, 45 per cent of the employed in this branch are above 50 years of age and 200,000 are pensioners. Even God cannot build modern agriculture out of this heritage, how can a minister do it in just a couple of months?—writes today's "TRUD," a daily of the Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria. The federation which organized today's rally is among its member organizations. According to "TRUD," the confederation backs the federation's demands. The federation, however, has been accused of disregarding the political agreement for social peace. The emphasis on the demand for the resignation of the minister of agriculture may bring to a cabinet crisis and might actually take the place of more important problems: immediate negotiations with the government and issuing a decree for the priority development of this branch, loosening the "nomenklatura chains," measures for a successful start of the Land Act and clearing away the "totalitarian silt."

Mr. Spirov himself was surprised by the federation's reaction, because, as he explains in "TRUD," on June 17 there were held talks between the ministry and the federation. They discussed a draft of ten demands of the federation and came to terms. At the meeting a representative of the federation agreed to strike out some of the demands as they proved to be beyond the competence of the ministry.

IMF To Help Revise Tax System

AU2506154991 Sofia BTA in English 1506 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, June 25 (BTA)—We have come to Bulgaria because we are worried by Bulgaria's insufficient budget revenue in the first quarter, Mr. Alan Tate, head of the Budget Revenue Department of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), told the press. After studying the reasons for the present situation, Mr. Tate concluded that Bulgaria's tax authorities are not to blame. The deficit is due to the macroeconomic conditions in the country and to the plummeting retail sales. The guest emphasized that he was impressed by the diligence of the government's economic team and praised the ongoing changes in Bulgaria.

A new taxation system will be introduced in Bulgaria with the help of the IMF and other international institutions. The government has reached an agreement on expanding the existing tax authorities.

Todorov 'Skeptical' About Relations With Turkey

AU2406201391 Sofia BTA in English 1953 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Mikhaela Vuzharova report]

[Text] Sofia, June 24 (BTA)—"I personally am somewhat skeptical about certain aspects of our relations with Turkey. We cannot fully accept the development of relations with that country in all their forms and aspects, if every time the Turkish side raises the human rights issue as an unsolved problem and a touchstone for these relations," the chairman of the Grand National Assembly, Acad. Nikolay Todorov, told a press conference in parliament today. The briefing was on a different subject, but Acad. Todorov came specially to share some of his conclusions from the visit he paid to Turkey as head of a multi-party parliamentary delegation.

He said that the Bulgarian side tried to draw a clear line between interstate relations and all attempts at interference in internal affairs and at assuming a "patronizing attitude" on some issues. The chairman of the Grand National Assembly noted certain biased commentaries in the Turkish press, which afforded insinuations that the rights of 2.5 million Turks and Muslims in Bulgaria need to be defended from without.

Acad. Todorov considered Bulgaro-Turkish relations in the context of the situation in the Balkans. Proceeding from some of his conclusions, he expressed the fear that in some individual cases the bilateral contacts may be used to oppose other countries with which Turkey has proved unable to settle its relations.

In general he described his talks in Turkey as fruitful, open and dominated by a desire to promote goodneighbour relations at all costs, at all levels and with all institutions.

Mr. Todorov also touched upon some topical internal political issues. In his opinion, some extremists from the Movement for Rights and Freedoms (DPS) are trying to impose and include in the constitution of Bulgaria some resolutions which have not yet been accepted by the European states and international organizations.

Spokesman Says SFRY Undergoing 'Reconstruction'

LD2506231991 Prague CTK in English 2039 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 25 (CTK)—"We still think that what is happening is not Yugoslavia's disintegration but the reconstruction of internal relations between its individual republics", Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry spokesman Egon Lansky told CTK today when asked to comment on the declarations of independence by Croatia and Slovenia.

He said Czechoslovakia has very friendly relations with Yugoslavia and the statements of the Slovenian and Croatian parliaments have to be studied first.

The Federal Government will have to discuss the situation and the Foreign Ministry will deal with Yugoslav bodies, or with new bodies in Croatia and Slovenia, on the basis of the government's decision. "We favour independence for each nation which wishes it. However, independence is not an easy matter", Lansky said.

Soviet General Discusses Troop Withdrawal

LD2606023291 Prague CTK in English 1342 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 25 (CTK)—The commissioner for the Soviet withdrawal from Czechoslovakia, General Eduard Vorobyev, said here today that the Soviet Army left Czechoslovakia on schedule and without major problems.

The last Soviet troops left Czechoslovakia last Friday [21 June].

Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Soviet troops stationed in Czechoslovakia for the past 22 years, told a news conference that the Soviet leadership had earlier acknowledged that the 1968 decision to send Soviet troops into Czechoslovakia was a mistake and had described it as groundless.

Vorobyev, who is the last serving Soviet soldier still in Czechoslovakia, expressed surprise at the fact that Czechs and Slovaks identified the Soviet soldiers as "occupiers", as the troops had never disregarded or violated Czechoslovak laws, he said. On November 17, 1989, and the days which followed, leading up to the collapse of the communist regime in Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Army maintained a neutral stand and refrained from interfering in Czechoslovak affairs, Vorobyev said.

He said he was also surprised by the abrupt disruption of contacts between the Czechoslovak and Soviet Armies after the November 1989. In speaking about the construction of a common European house, cooperation in all areas, including the military one, is necessary, Vorobyev said.

Chemical weapons have never been stored in Czechoslovakia, he said in response to a question on whether weapons of mass destruction were kept in the country. However, he confirmed that some nuclear warheads had been stationed in Czechoslovakia. All the warheads were removed in the first transports, he said.

Vorobyev said that whether or not Czechoslovakia joins NATO is the country's internal affair.

XXX

"The whole nation feels enormously relieved because our country is again completely free and sovereign", the chairman of the parliamentary commission for Soviet withdrawal from Czechoslovakia, Michael Kocab, told the news conference.

"I am very glad we have been able to complete this not very pleasant matter in such a friendly way", Kocab added.

He said the commission's original intention that the Federal Assembly (parliament) meet at a special session at Prague Castle on June 30 will not be realised.

On meeting Czechoslovak and Soviet Government commissioners in charge of the Soviet troops withdrawal, Czechoslovak parliament Chairman Alexander Dubcek rejected Monday's statement by Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov in the Czechoslovak independent paper "LIDOVE NOVINY" that the "entry" of Warsaw Pact troops into Czechoslovakia in August 1968 took place at the invitation of Czechoslovak leaders. Dubcek, who was Czechoslovak Communist Party leader at the time of the invasion, said documentary evidence contradicted Yazov's assertion and the invasion represented a violation of international law by the Soviet Union.

Regarding current relations with the Soviet Union, Dubcek emphasised the need to look towards the future and build relations on common links. He added that the process of European integration is impossible without the Soviet Union both for economic and security reasons.

Soviet Ambassador to Czechoslovakia Boris Pankin described the Soviet pullout from Czechoslovakia as a historic moment and a joint victory.

Havel Thanks USSR General for Cooperation

LD2606034791 Prague CTK in English 1545 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 25 (CTK)—Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel said at a meeting with Lieutenant General Eduard Vorobyev today that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia closed a sad chapter in the two countries' relations and opened up an era of real friendship based on equality.

Vorobyev, former commander of the Central Group of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia, informed Havel that the departure of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia was completed.

The last Soviet transport went through the Cierna nad Tisou, east Slovakia, railway crossing on June 21. The withdrawal took 16 months and was carried out in accord with the Czechoslovak-Soviet agreement signed in February 1990. At that time there were 73,500 Soviet troops and 43,000 family members in Czechoslovakia.

Havel thanked Vorobyev for good cooperation during the withdrawal.

Referring to the last session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, which will be held in Prague on July 1, Havel said it will mark the end of one era and the beginning of democratic cooperation between all countries of Europe.

Vorobyev described the year 1968, when a Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia by five Warsaw member countries' troops crushed a communist-led reform movement, as a gloomy one in the history of Czechoslovak-Soviet relations.

Present at the reception today were also Czechoslovak Government commissioner for the Soviet troops withdrawal Lieutenant General Rudolf Duchacek and chairman of the Czechoslovak parliament commission for the withdrawal Michael Kocab.

Treaty Coordination With USSR Discussed

LD2606025991 Prague CTK in English 1618 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 25 (CTK)—The Czechoslovak and Polish foreign ministers, Jiri Dienstbier and Krzysztof Skubiszewski, today agreed that Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary should coordinate the drafting of some articles of their future treaties with the Soviet Union.

The coordination should concern mainly the safeguards of security for the three Central European countries, Dienstbier and Skubiszewski stressed.

Skubiszewski arrived here today for a two-day official visit to Czechoslovakia.

In connection with the possible transport of Soviet troops leaving the former GDR via Czechoslovakia, Skubiszewski spoke about some problems Poland encounters in its talks with Soviet Army officials on the transit via the Polish [incomplete sentence as received]

Also today, Czechoslovak and Polish experts held talks on the Pentagonal group, which Poland would like to join. This would convert the grouping for regional cooperation associating Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Italy and Yugoslavia, into a hexagonal.

The experts also dealt with the coordination of Czechoslovak and Polish moves on the road of their integration into European institutions, and bilateral issues.

Rychetsky Says Moscow Cannot Pay Back Debts

AU2506091091 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 25 Jun 91 p 14

[APA report: "Moscow Cannot Pay Back Debts to Prague"]

[Text] Vienna—The decades of the CSFR's economic dependence from the USSR are responsible for the great economic difficulties of his country, CSFR Deputy Prime Minister Pavel R ky says. Of all former East bloc states, the CSFR ne Soviet Union's biggest creditor, Rychetsky said in Vienna. Moscow owes the CSFR about $5 billion. The Kremlin has indicated that it will not be able to pay its obligations within the next five years.

In addition, there is the CSFR's strong dependence on Soviet raw material deliveries, for which the USSR demands hard currency. Prague needs 14 million tonnes of crude oil per year. The sale of excess production of foodstuffs and industrial goods is being negotiated with Russia, Rychetsky said.

Industry Minister on Iranian Oil Deal

AU2506140291 Prague CTK in English 1601 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] Bratislava June 20 (CTK)—Slovak Industry Minister Jan Holcik told CTK today that the Soviet Union has not enough oil for export and that Iran will take over Soviet commitments to third countries. Soviet oil will continue to flow to Czechoslovakia through the Druzba oil pipeline.

A technological minimum of 12 million tonnes will be ensured, Holcik said. Moreover, Iran is willing to supply oil to Czechoslovakia by the Adria pipeline.

Holcik said a preliminary agreement was signed under which supplies of the missing two million tonnes of oil will be ensured by Iran from July.

There is a possibility for Czechoslovakia to participate in a project of the century, i.e., the construction of a gas pipeline connecting rich Iranian gas deposits with Central and Western Europe via Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Austria. From Austria it would fork to Germany, France, and to Central Europe, including Czechoslovakia.

Of the expected annual capacity of 28,000 to 32,000 million cubic meters of the gas pipeline, Czechoslovakia preliminarily promised to take 4,000 to 6,000 million cubic meters of gas a year, Holcik said.

Holcik accompanied Iranian Oil Minister Gholam Reza Aqazadeh, who arrived in Prague Tuesday [18 June], during his talks with Czechoslovak officials.

Pithart Rejects Sudeten German Proposal

LD2606035891 Prague CTK in English 1249 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 25 (CTK)—Czech Premier Petr Pithart has rejected a proposal by the leader of the Sudeten German Landsmannschaft to set up a commission for Czech-Sudeten German reconciliation, Pithart's spokesman Petr Prihoda told CTK today.

The suggestion to set up the commission was made by Franz Neubauer in a letter to Pithart, made public on Monday [24 June]. Neubauer's letter contained Sudeten German demands, e.g. recognition of the right of Sudeten Germans and their descendants, forced to leave Czechoslovakia after World War Two under provisions of the 1945 Potsdam agreements, to return to their former homeland and to reclaim confiscated property, with the provision that property rights of third persons are not infringed.

Pithart's reply noted the differences in the assessment of certain chapters of the history of the Czech lands, and referred to the activities of an independent commission of Czechoslovak and German historians.

Pithart sees inter-regional cooperation as a positive way of solving the open questions in relations between Czechs and Sudeten Germans, and insists that an overall settlement of relations must result from the talks between the Czechoslovak and German Governments.

Environmental Cooperation Agreement Signed

LD2206030191 Prague CTK in English 2006 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 21 (CTK)—An agreement was signed today between the French Environment Ministry and the Czechoslovak Federal Committee for the Environment on cooperation in environmental protection.

The document, initiated at the international environmental conference being held at Dobris Castle, provides for cooperation in preventing and controlling the air and water pollution, and in handling household and industrial waste. It also covers cooperation on operating safety at nuclear power plants.

A Czechoslovak-French committee was set up to coordinate environmental cooperation.

Klaus Says 1990 Economic Development Positive

AU2406130491 Prague CTK in English 2001 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 21 (CTK)—The Czechoslovak Federal Assembly (parliament) Planning and Budgetary Committees today recommended that parliament approve the 1990 state budgets of the Czechoslovak Federation and the Czech and Slovak Republics.

Czechoslovak Finance Minister Vaclav Klaus said there was a surplus of more than 6,900 million korunas in the 1990 budget. Expenditures totalled 476,500 million korunas. The federal budget expenditures amounted to 148,400 million korunas and its surplus, worth 4,000 million korunas, will go to financial reserves.

Klaus said economic developments in 1990 can already be evaluated as unexpectedly positive. He pointed out the importance of restrictive macroeconomic policies, which in his view, prevented a rapid rise in inflation and a balance of payments deficit.

Klaus also briefed deputies on a 200-million-dollar increase in Czechoslovakia's foreign debt in 1990, while Poland's debt rose by 7,000 million and Hungary's by 1,500 million dollars.

Slovak Council Approves Resolution on Screening

AU2506135891 Prague CTK in English 1845 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] Bratislava June 20 (CTK)—The Slovak National Council (parliament) today passed a resolution on screening people for possible past collaboration with the former StB secret service in Slovakia.

Under the resolution former StB members and secret collaborators will be barred from holding top positions in the republic. The resolution called on all people who knowingly collaborated with the StB to resign their posts in the Slovak parliament, government, Prosecutor's Office, the judiciary, and in the media.

The parliament is setting up a screening commission. After the screening process, the parliament Presidium will make public the names of deputies and Slovak government members found in the StB files, if they do not resign their posts within 15 days of being told the result of the screening process. The entire process is expected to be finished by December 31, 1992.

A similar resolution was passed by the Czech National Council (parliament) earlier this month.

Meanwhile, Federal Premier Marian Calfa said in an interview in today's issue of the Czech daily "MLADA FRONTA DNES" that a Federal bill on the screening process is currently being drawn up and is expected to be passed by the Federal parliament in autumn. This law would be in effect until the end of 1993, he said.

Slovak Government Holds Session in Bratislava

AU2106175891 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 20 Jun 91 pp 1, 2

[CTK report: "We Cannot Do Without Corrections"]

[Text] Bratislava— The session of the Slovak Republic government continued yesterday in Bratislava. The government noted the first quarter report on the state of the Slovak Republic national economy and its anticipated

development until the end of 1991. A positive aspect is internal convertibility of the koruna, the start of small privatization, and measures in the social sphere to alleviate impacts of the reform on, above all, retired people. However, national income declined 7.1 percent, compared to the first quarter of 1990, and unemployment reached 3.7 percent. Enterprises' insolvency reached 22.3 billion korunas. The state budget surplus of 3.3 billion korunas has not been attained by increased income but by curbs imposed on spending. As a result of price liberalization, prices for goods and services increased almost 36 percent in the first quarter, compared to December 1990. The sharp January increase slowed down markedly in March; prices for some goods even began to decline.

Enterprises' Pessimism

A large majority of enterprises anticipate further deterioration in their economic situation in the second quarter. If corrections are not made in macroeconomic measures, we may expect that, by the end of this year, unemployment will reach 11 to 13 percent and national income will decline more than 12 percent compared to last year.

The government heard reports on securing the activity of the Slovak Republic Prosecutor's Office by its staff and on the draft for the further course of action. At present, the Prosecutor's Office lacks 107 prosecutors and 33 investigating officers. The presented material contains some measures for increasing the social prestige of prosecutors and, consequently, the interest of lawyers in this work.

Further, the government noted the report on the resettlement of Soviet citizens of Slovak origin from the region hit by the Chernobyl disaster to the Slovak Republic. The number of people considered [for resettlement] has been made more precise—some 300 families containing 1,100 members are involved so far. The government agreed with the draft agreement on evaluating environmental influences extending beyond state borders.

The "Law on Women" Has Not Been Passed

In view of the unclear situation surrounding legal, ownership, and other aspects of the problem pertaining to the property of the former Slovak Union of Women, the government decided that M. Porubiak, Slovak Republic first deputy prime minister, will present to the government new material reflecting new facts.

The Slovak Republic government discussed also some personnel issues. It approved the new composition of the Slovak Republic Government Economic Council. The chairman is A. Vavro, Slovak Republic deputy prime minister; deputy chairman is J. Danco, Slovak Republic finance minister; and secretary is M. Vallo. The government recalled Engineer V. Kopinic from his function of the Slovak Republic deputy minister of international relations. It appointed Associate Professor Doctor J. Dravecky, candidate of sciences (age 44), and Engineer Architect J. Havelka (age 47) deputy ministers. It appointed Engineer Podstransky (age 37) Slovak Republic deputy minister of agriculture and food.

The Slovak Republic government also discussed some other topics.

Carnogursky on State Treaty, Slovak Issues

AU2506075591 Prague SVOBODNE SLOVO in Czech 21 Jun 91 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Slovak Prime Minister Jan Carnogursky by Miroslav Valka; place and date not given: "This 'For the Moment' Disturbs Us"]

[Text] [Valka] Mr. Prime Minister, could you at least briefly outline for our readers why the Slovak side insists so much on a state treaty? What should it contain and guarantee? This issue has been under discussion for a long time and the ordinary citizen does not in fact know what it involves. Many people think it is a Slovak invention or something.

[Carnogursky] The state treaty should legally document the status of both republics. It should express the republics' elemental sovereignty derived from the Federation. It should contain an enumeration of the jurisdiction yielded by the republics to the Federation and should probably also contain a system of joint organs. This is certainly not a Slovak invention; a state treaty has been discussed in Yugoslavia, and in the Soviet Union they already have specific proposals. In 1987 the Canadian provinces concluded a treaty at Meach Lake as the basis for an amendment to the Canadian Constitution.

[Valka] Czechs are finding it difficult to reconcile themselves to the fact that you are saying yes to the Federation, for the moment. This "for the moment" disturbs a lot of people.

[Carnogursky] As far as I am concerned, the words "for the moment" relate to the current period, to the period prior to the conclusion of negotiations between Czechoslovakia and the European Community on our entry into the European Community. The conditions for our entry should be agreed upon in such a way that the Slovak Republic, as well as the Czech Republic, have their own status within the European Community. Moreover, all their ties—I mean between the Slovak and Czech Republics—would be, as opposed to their ties to the European Community, a matter for their own decisionmaking. Undoubtedly, there would be many such ties and many of them would be expressed institutionally. If it was impossible to agree on such a status for both republics during the negotiations with the European Community, the Slovak Republic would have to consider whether it would be interested in joining the EC under such conditions.

[Valka] During the period when Vladimir Meciar was recalled from his post as Slovak prime minister, we in

Bohemia and Moravia were worried about Slovak unrest. How can we explain the fact that the proclaimed social storms did not take place?

[Carnogursky] It is a question of how much real support the declared strikes had from the population. However, the fact that, momentarily, there is no realistic political line other than the one represented by the current Slovak government is, I believe, a decisive factor.

[Valka] Before Mr. Meciar was recalled, it was said in the Slovak National Council that when people find out about certain circumstances, their amazement will know no ends. A relatively long time has passed and nothing has been made public.

[Carnogursky] I did not promise any revelations and I do not consider this my problem.

[Valka] When he left his post, Vladimir Meciar gave the Slovak government a two month ultimatum. This period has more or less passed and nothing....

[Carnogursky] Vladimir Meciar himself offered me the post of Slovak prime minister even before he was recalled from his post. He made the offer twice. In essence, he was interested in leaving the government since he was aware of the burden of responsibility that the government bears and that he himself was probably not willing to bear it. Incidentally, prior to his recall from the government, he said in a newspaper interview that he considers it an advantage that he is not a member of the government.

[Valka] Mr. Meciar is the Movement For a Democratic Slovakia's [HZDS] leading representative. He did not participate in the Budmerice talks and was again absent in Kromeriz. Do you know why?

[Carnogursky] I do not. This is an HZDS issue.

[Valka] In a recent edition of the "Events of the Week" program, Mr. Rychetsky talked about the possibility of a tripartite federation. However, the presenter—in an unfortunate intervention in the discussion—did not allow him to answer the entire question. How do you yourself view the Moravian issue? It seems that V. Meciar sometimes played on this string.

[Carnogursky] I personally feel that it would be an advantage if Moravia were to have a certain kind of constitutional and legal status. I admit that I have problems convincing my friends in my own movement of the advantages of such a position for Moravia. Slovakia would require constitutional guarantees that it could not be outvoted by Bohemia and Moravia in important issues. However, I can very well imagine that in many issues Moravia and Slovakia would pull ideologically on the same rope; therefore, I was sympathetic to the idea of an individual constitutional and legal arrangement for Moravia within the framework of the republic.

[Valka] Reports that the prices of certain goods will be reduced in Slovakia and that subsidies from the National Property Fund will be used for this have caused indignation in Bohemia and Moravia.

[Carnogursky] Reducing the prices of goods whose supply exceeds demand is a normal economic measure. No subsidies from the National Property Fund will be utilized for such a reduction.

[Valka] Mr. Prime Minister, does Czechoslovakism mean something pejorative to you?

[Carnogursky] This concept means something more tragicomical to me. An attempt was made to pretend something is true that is not true. That is, there is one Czechoslovak nation. The tragedy of this concept and this policy is that they have led the Republic along domestic political paths which have no prospects and which even today oppress our political and—obviously—psychological atmosphere in the search for new directions.

[Valka] What kind of changes in economic reform would you like to see in connection with the so-called Slovak specific features?

[Carnogursky] In implementing the Slovak government's economic policy we have, so far, not had to abandon the principles of economic reform because we are able to include our economic policy within the framework of the approved scenario for economic reform.

[Valka] Mr. Meciar often claimed that he had strong contacts with Petr Pithart and that they understood each other. Of course, it seemed rather more complicated to us. How do you evaluate your cooperation with the Czech prime minister?

[Carnogursky] I cooperate with him very well. Of course, I do not know whether by giving you such an answer I am damaging him in the Czech lands. Respect for long-term historic trends and a commitment to finding democratic solutions to social problems unite us.

[Valka] Mr. Prime Minister, thank you for the interview.

KDH Adopts Resolution on State Arrangement

AU2606005791 Bratislava SLOVENSKY DENNIK in Slovak 24 Jun 91 p 1

["Resolution Adopted by the Christian Democratic Movement Council on the CSFR's Future Constitutional and Legal Arrangement"]

[Text] The Christian Democratic Movement [KDH] Council adopted a resolution on the CSFR's future constitutional and legal arrangement at the end of its session on 22 June. It made note of reports from KDH Chairman Jan Carnogursky and KDH Council Presidium Member Ivan Simka about the talks on the

principles for the future constitutional and legal arrangement involving constitutional officials and representatives from the political parties and movements held in Kromeriz on 17 June 1991. On the basis of the Kromeriz talks, the future constitutional and legal arrangement for the joint state of Slovaks and Czechs will consist of the following:

1. A treaty concluded between the Slovak National Council, representing the Slovak Republic, and the Czech National Council, representing the Czech Republic.

2. A constitution adopted by the Federal Assembly on the basis of the treaty between the Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic with the proviso that:

a) The constitution for the joint state adopted by the Federal Assembly is subject to ratification in the national councils;

b) The joint state's one chamber legislature is composed of an equal number of deputies from the national councils.

Young Democratic Left Organization Established

AU1906140391 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 17 Jun 91 p 3

["(AO)"-signed report: "The Young Democratic Left"]

[Text] Zvolen— Most likely, we have the youngest president in Europe. He is Brano Ondrus, who was elected to this function—not a state function, of course—at the 15 June constituent meeting of the Young Democratic Left [Mlada Demokraticka Lavica].

The four preceding all-Slovak meetings involving representatives of the Left-Wing Youth clubs resulted in the decision to establish a new organization. Biba Guldajova from Spisska Nova Ves—where the club is one of the most active—has become the new vice president. According to the approved statutes and policy statements, the Young Democratic Left is an independent civic association of left-oriented youth in Slovakia. It seeks to support the objectives in the policy statement of the Party of the Democratic Left and the principles of the new leftist movement in Europe. In asserting the interests of the young generation, it will strive for cooperation with all democratic youth organizations at home and abroad.

The Young Democratic Left will register at the Ministry of the Interior in a couple of days. The approved documents will be confirmed by an assembly in the fall. The main activity of its basic elements—the clubs—will consist mainly of the special-interest activity and activity in the social sphere. By kindling bonfires in various Slovak cities on the eve of the anniversary of the [Slovak National] Uprising, the Young Leftist Democrats want to support the proposal of a group of deputies that the Slovak National Council declare 29 August the Slovak Republic national holiday.

Czech National Council Appoints Control Minister

LD2006230391 Prague Ceskoslovensky Rozhlas Radio Network in Slovak 1300 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] The Czech National Council is holding its 20th session in Prague today. It continues to discuss a government bill on a police force for the Czech Republic.

The Council Presidium appointed Igor Nemec of the Civic Democratic Party to the post of Czech minister of control.

Talks With USSR on Troop Withdrawal End

No Protocol Signed

LD2506134291 Budapest MTI in English 1313 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 25, 1991 (MTI-Econews)—Following several weeks of negotiations, the talks on the Soviet troop pull- out from Hungary ended here today with no closing protocol having been signed.

The deadline for signing is June 30, Ministry of Defence Spokesman Gyorgy Keleti told Econews today.

The Soviet side refused to accept Hungary's proposal that the protocol should lay down that relevant clauses of Hungarian-Soviet documents concluded in 1957, 1958 and 1990 should be taken as decisive starting points at further talks.

In the absence of this, these agreements would be regarded as null and void once the troops withdrawal is complete.

These articles are of determining importance for reaching an agreement on the legal aspects of ownership and financial accounting.

The Soviets do not acknowledge Hungary's claim for 98 billion forints, 60 billion of which is for serious environmental damage.

The Soviet side also argues that Hungary's claim for over 5 billion forints for damage done to historic buildings is unjustified.

Until June 18, the Soviets were demanding 50 billion forints from the Hungarians, 27 billion of which was for more than 2,000 installations the Soviets built here illegally.

Most of these buildings are unsuitable for civilian purposes.

Then, suddenly, on June 18, the Soviets doubled their claim without any justification, and would only accept Hungarian environmental damage claims up to 2 billion forints which they recognized as having been caused during the actual pull-out.

Talks on the financial and legal implications of ownership are now likely to continue on a higher level, and it is imaginable that independent international experts will be called in to judge the controversial claims.

Antall, Fur on Talks

LD2506232191 Budapest MTV Television Network in Hungarian 1915 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Studio interview with Prime Minister Joszef Antall and Defense Minister Lajlos Fur by Laszo Rapcsanyi: "Cabinet Questions"—live]

[Excerpts] [Rapcsanyi] Greetings to the prime minister and the defense minister, and I thank you for accepting the invitation for this live program at such a late hour since today you had quite enough on your plate. However, let us start with the most important thing: The result is no. Mr. Defense Minister.

[Fur] Indeed, signing that certain document that would have closed the circle of questions on the Soviet troop withdrawal did not take place. However, it is an historic fact that the Soviet troop withdrawal is completed, and this pullout had another side that created a series of negotiations lasting for months between the two parties. Namely, the settlement of questions of an economic and financial nature took place parallel with the very precisely kept pullout schedule of the Soviet troops. Here the negotiations understandably showed the most varied fluctuations, since serious financial questions—I could also say that a calling to account—was in the cards. The various values left behind by the Soviet troops had to be assessed, and the damage had to be evaluated. The Hungarian party claimed this right from the beginning of the negotiations.

The Soviet parties did not represent the same stance all the way through in these matters. Their approach varied. Sometimes they showed greater readiness for agreement, or the preparations for an agreement—for this was only a preparation by experts here—and sometimes their stances went rigid. Thus, today also ended with the positions not nearing each other.

There are two issues here to lay down, two questions in one document— first to state partly the mere fact that the withdrawal of the Soviet troops has finished, and on the other hand, to summarize the financial questions debated at the experts' negotiations that will be finalized during intergovernmental negotiations.

[Rapcsanyi] How long was this agreement proposal?

[Fur] The agreement was not long, a text of one and a half pages. So we should not have to talk too long about this. However, views differed. This text of one and a half pages was our proposal. The Soviet party did not except this. Thus, the whole issue will be transferred now to the level of intergovernmental negotiations.

[Rapcsanyi] How did you part? Was it a cool parting?

[Fur] Perhaps not too cool. However, on the substance of the question, the expert talks, due to a very rigid approach, did not result in an agreement.

[Rapcsanyi] Mr. Prime Minister, was this surprising?

[Antall] I am not easily surprised. This could be expected. Naturally, we strived and still strive to achieve an agreement, but these are very serious and difficult questions. [passage omitted]

The fact that today we did not succeed in signing these minutes that Minister Fur discussed just now, in fact, does not mean some sort of catastrophic ending to the

affair. It is only that the government representatives did not manage to come to an agreement regarding accounts.

I would like to mention here that, in principle, the actual accounting, referring to the whole pullout based on the intergovernmental agreement concluded in March 1990, has to be completed by 30 June. Well, so far, this was not successful. I think that the Hungarian government and the Hungarian government representative made every effort so that the experts' investigations and assessments could be completed. We have rather missed seeing and also objected to the fact that the Soviet environmental experts have not arrived. Thus, the professional materials prepared by the Hungarian experts on environmental protection could not be examined. This is more than 10,000 pages, so to plow through this is rather a big job.

I would like to mention that the Soviet troops' stay in Hungary is based on various bilateral and international legal agreements. Until 1947, that is, until the Paris peace treaty, the Soviet Army stayed in Hungary as a warring party. [passage omitted]

Debates were carried out for months, and on 8 April 1991, an agreement was signed settling the method of accounting. This was also signed by Lieutenant General Shilov and Lieutenant General Annus, and an assessment of the damages was made on the basis of this agreement. This method, in fact, gave the sum that is the basis of the Hungarian demand.

The Soviet party calculates the costs on the basis of the establishments left behind here; thus, the Hungarian party acknowledges those buildings that are built according to Hungarian standards on areas where they can be used, etc. The value of these we take as a base, and naturally we consider them when we make out the inventory.

[Rapcsanyi] But the money is with them?

[Antall] At present, on one side this is a matter of accounting. There are certain items on one side, and on the other side there are the Hungarian claims for damages, usage, and other debts. So this is the financial settlement, the accounting in connection with the withdrawal of the troops.

We have to say that, by the 19th, the withdrawal of the Soviet troops had been completed, so the Soviet partner fulfilled the terms of the agreement concerning the withdrawal of the troops correctly. On the other side, however, we have not yet completed the financial settlements.

[Rapcsanyi] [passage omitted] Is it possible that when the troops of a large and proud country withdraw, the attitude of the nation is also present? Do you not think so Mr. Prime Minister?

[Antall] Obviously, there are a variety of interests in the Soviet Union, and it is also obvious that the army, on the one side, is putting its own interests and problems into the foreground. The location of the withdrawing soldiers, officers, and their families without doubt presents very great problems in the Soviet Union. Here it is simply a problem of existence for the Soviet Army, including the troops being withdrawn from Czechoslovakia and Germany as well.

In addition, it is also obvious that a withdrawal is a very difficult question. I meant it, not perhaps as a consolation but rather as a moral satisfaction, when I said at the farewell to Lt. Gen. Shilov that with this step the Soviet Union has increased its moral standing in world politics, its prestige. This, by the way, was quoted by the progressive papers in the Soviet Union as well.

[Rapcsanyi] And what did the Soviet Lt. Gen. say to this?

[Antall] The soldiers can keep quiet in a disciplined military manner.

So, apart from this, this is one side. On the other side are President Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze [as heard]. Without trying to react to this, and certainly I do not think it is my task to defend now former Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, and I would certainly not like to do him any harm. So obviously Soviet politics is not united in approving the withdrawal from the eastern central European region. We have to recognize that this at the end, in addition to international politics and the attitude of these people, is also a Soviet decision.

[Rapcsanyi] What kinds of diplomatic opportunities are available for us?

[Antall] We have to continue the negotiations persistently. Earlier you referred to the question of money. Clearly, we have with the Soviet Union a net positive balance of around 1.5 billion dollars. This means that the Soviet Union owes us 1.5 billion dollars for goods delivered until now. This is one side of the question. We have outstanding funds from the Soviet Union, about which we have to discuss on what terms and how they can repay this to us.

On the other hand we want to continue our trading relations with the Soviet Union. It is important that in Hungarian foreign trade the Soviet share has been reduced to below 20 percent. This is a significant decrease and means at the same time that the Hungarian economy can change its geographical direction, but it would be madness...

[Rapcsanyi, interrupts] Can you give up?

[Antall] We have not the slightest intention of giving up the Soviet market, or cooperation, and even less would we consider it right to have bad relations with the Soviet Union, which is a great power, a great nuclear power. So we have to view these questions together.

I think that the Soviet government honors international law and other considerations and will not mix foreign

trade with the question of the financial settlement on the withdrawal of the Soviet troops.

[Rapcsanyi] Experts should read the detailed submission about the claims.

[Fur] They should already have read it earlier, and we should have worked together, cooperated with these experts, because these claims not only concern environmental damages, but the neglect of buildings, and whether these are still fit for use or not. So these questions are complex and many-sided, perhaps historic buildings, for example the Grassalkovics manor in Goedoello. [passage omitted]

[Rapcsanyi] The Defense Ministry has, for the time being, virtually completed these talks. Is that not so? It cannot do anything else.

[Fur] It was not the ministry, as such, that was involved, but rather, the administrative state secretary of the ministry was the government commissioner who from the outset held talks with the Soviet side on the withdrawal and on the issue of economic accounts. Of course, it does not know what to do. However, allow me to stress what the prime minister emphasized just now: how important cooperation in the future is for us from the viewpoint not only of trade but also because of other considerations, especially because of security policy considerations in the new situation that has developed in the region. It is necessary to find the important points and possibilities of cooperation that can guarantee the region's security in this situation, the transitional stage, until a firmer European security system comes about. For example, we want to cooperate in the military (?sphere).

[Rapcsanyi] This has not happened, but irrespective of this, the Soviet troops have withdrawn, and I do not know what kind of atmosphere this no generates in the country's public opinion. However, the truth is that they have gone.

[Antall] I believe that the whole question should be handled thus. The Soviet troops have withdrawn; part of the agreement has been fulfilled. I believe that this is an historic turning point and an event of historic significance, that foreign troops are not stationed on Hungary's territory, and that Hungary has regained its sovereignty. Everyone should take note of this with dignity, without being taken in by demagogy, because this is what the country's interest, the country's people, expects of us, and this is what the world expects of us: that we should take note of this with the appropriate dignity.

It is necessary to be aware that much, except for politicizing, can be done vis-a-vis geography, and geography does not change. Thus, this must be taken into consideration on the one hand, and on the other hand, we must very firmly represent Hungarian national interests. It is also natural that such statements [as heard] are expressed in the Soviet Union, since it obviously has not caused pleasure for everyone.

On the other hand, there has been no sort of catastrophe with this no. Let there be no misunderstanding. Czechoslovakia, for example, has not even concluded the agreement on methodological issues that we concluded on 8 April, and Czechoslovakia still faces these tasks. Soviet troops have pulled out from there too, but talks continue on these issues.

When Minister Katushev was here, and I received him, we agreed that, on the one hand, Lt. Gen. Shilov would return in civilian clothes and continue the talks. That would be one of the levels, that of experts. On the other hand, the talks at the ministerial level would continue. Therefore, these talks will continue in the coming period. Here there are naturally arguments over whether the agreements that we concluded earlier, or rather that were concluded on behalf of Hungary in 1957, 1958, and whether the requirements contained in them have changed, because of the fact that 30 June (?has passed).

The legal basis on which we must hold talks at government level remains, and I imagine the Soviet Government will, in the end, judge this in a similar manner to us, and we will both strive for this. In international politics it would not be in the interest of either the Soviet Union or any other country for such focal points of tension to remain in this region.

[Rapcsanyi] On 30 June there will be various celebrations, large and small, and there will obviously be enthusiasm. Let the fact that there has been no signing now not disturb anything, and let the country, the nation, be aware that it has happened, with the appropriate dignity. I imagine this is what the prime minister was referring to. Thank God.

[Antall] The withdrawal of the Soviet Troops has taken place; the dissolution of CMEA will take place in Budapest; a similar gesture in connection with the Warsaw Pact will take place in Prague. Thus, they will be historic processes. This will all take place in connection with that. I believe that the main thing is that these things have happened, and the two sides in the end will resolve these economic, financial accounts, since it is in the interest of both of us that this should happen.

The Hungarian Government represents with full responsibility and resolve the intention for agreement, but we wish to draw up the balance on the basis of really calculated and well-definable sums, naturally not on the basis of guesses. We are striving to come to agreement, and we are striving to have a good relationship with the Soviet Union. The Hungarian people obviously must be aware of what the Soviet Union means as a trade partner, what it means as a neighbor, and it must be aware that this historic gesture must be made with decency and as befits Hungarian national dignity. Obviously such a decision is not easy for the Soviet Union, just as it is not easy for any major country to withdraw from territories or to relinquish territories, of which there have been examples in the past decades on the part of other major

countries and empires. This, properly speaking, worked to the benefit of these countries regarding their international reputation.

[Rapcsanyi] Prime Minister and Defense Minister, thank you for the late evening conversation.

Dear viewers, we will meet in the fall with the program, "Cabinet Questions," and with similar programs. Goodbye.

Goncz Letter to Gorbachev

LD2406192391 Budapest MTI in English 1442 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Budapest, June 24 (MTI)—To mark the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, Arpad Goncz, president of the Republic of Hungary, has sent a letter to Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union, saying among other things:

Now that the Soviet Union has withdrawn its army from Hungary by its own volition within the framework of a bilateral agreement resulting in the restoration in full of the country's sovereignty, allow me to express my sincere gratitude to you.

The period between the end of the war and your decisive political activity was marked in Europe by immobility, a cold war, a nuclear ban and nuclear peace. However, now a country on the way to democracy is bidding farewell to the troops of another newly democratizing country. I very much hope that the years lying ahead of us will issue in a period of genuine peace to the peoples of both countries, the period of a single Europe and democracy.

The Soviet people are justly proud of their army and their role in the Great Patriotic War, and have reason to mourn their heroes, many of whom are resting in Hungarian soil. The least I can promise today is that we shall respect and look after their graves.

In expressing my thanks to you for the disciplined and planned pull-out of the Soviet Army, I would also like to believe that your recollections of Hungary are favourable. I am hopeful that in the future the two countries will be struggling side by side for the common goal, a single and peaceful Europe.

Antall on Sovereignty

AU2506101291 Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian 22 Jun 91 p 6

[Interview with Prime Minister Jozsef Antall by Attila Kristof; place and date not given: "Our Sovereignty Is Guaranteed by Our Domestic Stability"]

[Text] [Kristof] The pace of the Soviet troop withdrawal proves that our country's independence can hardly be linked to a specific day or moment. This is clearly a longer process. What stage have we reached now?

[Antall] According to the treaty, as of 1 July 1991, Hungary will be a country where no foreign troops will be stationed (not even formally). Our country will be freed of all alliance constraints that used to affect Hungarian sovereignty. However, during our period of government, Hungary already operated totally independently of the Soviet Union. I can calmly state that since the inauguration of our government, Soviet policy, the Soviet Government, and the Soviet troops stationed in Hungary have not affected our functioning in the least. They did not force their will upon us either directly or indirectly.

[Kristof] When did you first feel that this stage had been reached?

[Antall] I clearly felt it when the treaty was signed. However, in 1988, we could already feel that we were at the beginning of a process that would lead to the present stage. That is what Viktor Orban [parliamentary faction leader of the Federation of Young Democrats] spoke about at the funeral of Imre Nagy and his followers. It was mentioned in the by-election program of parliamentary representative Gabor Rozsik. At the second national congress of the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF] in October 1989, I said that if they took the handcuffs off our wrists, we would lend them a friendly hand. At that point, I was already convinced that the Soviet troops could withdraw.

[Kristof] Can this emerging independence be realized and sustained in the immediate proximity of a superpower?

[Antall] From a constitutional and international legal point of view, our independence and sovereignty definitely come into force after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops. However, it is also true that a country's geographical position automatically implies the acknowledgement of certain duties and geopolitical factors. The Soviet Union and Russia have been great powers (even superpowers) for centuries; the Soviet Union has even been a nuclear world power. That is one thing that has to be borne in mind. The other thing to remember is that the EC is the basis for stability in the whole of Europe, and a united Germany clearly plays—and will continue to play—a very important role in this community. I definitely think that the presence of NATO and the United States in Europe is very important. The fates of North America and Europe are indivisible. The Atlantic alliance and the Atlantic concept date back to centuries ago, and from the point of view of European security, the two World Wars prove the indivisibility of the United States and Europe. America's presence is quite simply a fundamental guarantee for European security. European unity and the Atlantic alliance are the two elements that I consider to be fundamentally important for Hungary's foreign policy. We have to find the guarantees that will secure Hungary's independence and the independence of other countries that do not belong to NATO and have not yet been accepted into the EC.

[Kristof] The unification of Western Europe cannot take place again without Hungary's participation....

[Antall] I do not think that unification can be limited to Western Europe any more. The EC will take a step forward at some stage. Following the customs union and the creation of a common currency in 1993, Sweden and Austria will be the two countries to have easiest access to the EC. During the second half of the decade, the countries of Eastern and Central Europe will have a chance of gaining full membership in the community. The question is: How will we be able to guarantee the security of this region over the next five or six years when destabilizing problems may emerge in the Soviet Union and Eastern and Central Europe, from the Baltics to the Balkans? Nevertheless, I think that Hungary's independence and sovereignty are guaranteed in principle if the country maintains its domestic stability. In the present international situation, this country can really only be ruined from the inside.

[Kristof] Does our economic reliance on the Soviet Union not imply further dependency?

[Antall] I think that the former dependency between the Soviet Union and Hungary can be turned into good-neighborly cooperation, a cooperation that is based on sovereignty. The Soviet Union's internal transformation and the Soviet crisis forced the Hungarian economy to change directions, to emerge on the "hard markets," and to present quality goods that it could sell. Hungary's economy and know-how can be very proud of the fact that they succeeded in doing this. Hungary's economy was able to change directions. The drop in Soviet-Hungarian economic relations represented an enormous loss for us, but at the same time, we underwent a positive change: Hungary is now less and less dependent on Soviet raw materials and the Soviet market.

[Kristof] What does that imply in the long term?

[Antall] I think that we have accomplished some long-term changes. Naturally, we would not like to lose the Soviet Union as a significant trade partner: It would be extremely stupid to lose the Soviet market. The question is primarily how we will cope with the interim period until the Soviet Union and the individual Republics become solvent. We could develop long-term cooperation agreements based on mutual interests.

[Kristof] Do our debts to the West not represent another limitation in our independence?

[Antall] Naturally, our moves and our situation are made more difficult by Hungary's debt, which totals $21 billion, and particularly by the fact that our country has to pay $4 billion in interest and capital repayments this year. This clearly represents dependency. Almost 40 percent of our debt is owed to Germany, approximately another 40 percent is due to Japan, and at the same time, half the working capital invested in Hungary comes from the United States. These factors influence our steps and our behavior, but we try to maintain our independence in all circumstances. We have to stick to our fundamental values, such as national independence, national sovereignty, a constitutional state, and a market economy; we have to remain faithful to the European system of values that developed during the 19th century. Nevertheless, at the end of the 20th century, we cannot interpret all this in the spirit of the 19th century. European integration acknowledges mutual dependence on the basis of national sovereignty and voluntary decisions. Our indebtedness is a fact, as are the very strict requirements that we are fulfilling in connection with this indebtedness. We cannot harbor any illusions: Big multinational enterprises, banks, and governments are trying to represent their own interests in Hungary (as well as in other countries), they are trying to increase their own economic influence. This is not as simple or straightforward as many people think. Competition is very tough. Governments and heads of government might be on good terms, but U.S. and German (or French and Japanese) enterprises still fight to kill on the market. Hungary has not been left out of this competition. That is one of the advantages of a market economy, but these governments and countries also express their influencing efforts in very loud and clear terms. "Total economic independence"—the possibility of autonomous decisions and a situation where we are the only ones to decide with our 10 million-strong population and our order of magnitude—is a naive concept. It is either naive or demagogic.

[Kristof] To what extent would our possible accession to the Western European Union [WEU] or our EC membership influence all this?

[Antall] As far as our EC membership is concerned, we are currently talking about an association that could lead to full accession. Hopefully, this association will come into force on 1 January 1992. The most critical points are our agricultural imports and the textile issue. Those are the two points where negotiations are the toughest. Rich countries have a great surplus of agricultural products and poor countries are insolvent. In answer to the other part of your question, I have to say that in 1990, in Helsinki, I pointed out that I did not think it was inconceivable to examine the possibility of the WEU (as a European union) providing a certain security framework for those European countries that are not members of NATO or the EC; these countries could join the WEU through the intermediary of European countries like the "Visegrad three" [Hungary, Poland, and the CSFR]. We spoke at length about this when I delivered my speech in Helsinki, and since then it has been stated repeatedly that the WEU could be revived, that it could represent a link that would connect the EC and European countries to NATO. The argument against a broadening of the WEU (as a union for European military security) is the fact that it arouses the mistrust of the United States, as though it were aimed against NATO. That would be out of the question. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, might not be too thrilled about this kind of rapprochement either. These questions are slowly coming to the fore.

[Kristof] What role could the Hexagonale play in the defense of Hungarian independence?

[Antall] The Hexagonale—the successor of the Pentagonale—is, in fact, only just emerging. Hungary greatly contributed to Poland's accession to this organization, and this is something that the Poles greatly appreciate. With Poland's accession, the Hexagonale will represent a regional union that stretches geographically from the Baltics to the Mediterranean. It is important that the Hexagonale includes a NATO member (Italy), a neutral country (Austria), a non-aligned country (the SFRY), and three former Warsaw Pact countries (with Poland's accession). The Hexagonale is therefore a very heterogeneous organization with a mixed structure. It cannot be said that in the Hexagonale, "the blind lead the blind." Indeed, there are some blooming market economies in the Hexagonale (Italy and Austria). The Hexagonale is primarily a political organization. Secondly, it can further economic cooperation. The development of a transport infrastructure is of key importance to economic cooperation—that is to say, the building of big European transport roads on a north-south axis. Italy's Foreign Minister de Michelis was one of the initiators in this area; the whole idea, in fact, stems from Italy, and it shows that Italy is undertaking an increasingly big role in Central Europe. Otto von Habsburg once said that this organization might seem anti-German. That is incorrect. The Hexagonale is absolutely not directed against Germany—on the contrary, it has close links with Germany. With the inclusion of Poland, Hungary has come to the center of the Hexagonale; the road south from Poland goes through Hungary. This is also important for Slovakia, and the Slovak Government appreciates this. Poland's presence excludes any possibility of a north-south transport road avoiding Hungary or the Carpathian Basin....

[Kristof] We have talked about independence and stability. Is Hungary's situation more stable or better than it was six months ago, when you last granted MAGYAR NEMZET an interview?

[Antall] It is difficult to answer that question. I think that as far as the future and real developments are concerned, Hungary's economic situation has improved. There are facts to prove this point: Hungary's hard currency reserves have tripled over the last year, our economy was able to turn toward hard markets in the West, we survived the winter, and we survived the collapse of the Soviet market. If we compare our situation to the situation of other former Communist countries, we have to say that the recent period has in fact been successful. However, let us consider what all this has meant for the Hungarian population: The last few months have represented a drop or a stagnation in living standards for large parts of the population, domestic social tensions have grown, people have become increasingly dissatisfied, the settlement of the property issue has been dragged out in time, and we have not passed certain economic bills—we can hardly be satisfied with all this. Despite all that, whilst acknowledging and taking all difficult points into account, I can still say that we are on the right track.

Labor Minister on Moonlighting, Unemployment

AU2506100091 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 21 Jun 91 p 5

[Interview with Minister of Labor Gyula Kiss by Zsuzsa Varga; place and date not given: "Moonlighting and Unemployment"—first paragraph is NEPSZAVA introduction]

[Text] Labor ministers of 140 countries participated in the "big week" of the International Labor Affairs Conference in Geneva. Among them was Gyula Kiss, who gave an interview to our correspondent after returning home.

[Varga] Did the conference have a central theme?

[Kiss] Yes, it was the second economy, and we analyzed its positive and negative effects. One of the positive traits is that the second economy absorbs manpower and contributes to reducing unemployment, and it creates extra income for the employee. At the same time, there is no legal protection for these people with respect to work time, working environment, or wages.

[Varga] Nevertheless, it is exactly the lack of regulations that makes moonlighting attractive for the employer, for example, who can avoid paying taxes in such cases.

[Kiss] That is true, but it is hard to accept the lack of regulations in a market economy, where labor is also a product sold on the market.

[Varga] As far as I know, we occupy a distinguished position in the area of moonlighting. Many people think that we are on the way toward an Italian-type economy in this respect. Do you agree?

[Kiss] I certainly agree with the fact that we have a lot of moonlighting, which is not a great honor, but, to a certain extent, it is also a natural reaction to the 40 years of rigid structure; therefore, we certainly cannot be surprised by it.

[Varga] What other topics did you discuss?

[Kiss] We talked a lot about infrastructure; its establishment and operation can provide an opportunity for the unemployed to break free from their situation because many people can be employed at building roads, for example. Another significant topic was the issue of refugees, and I do not think that the public realizes the importance of this issue yet. I also think it is unfortunate that many of the representatives of Western countries handle Eastern Europe in a uniform way, although it is very likely that Hungary would become a target country in many respects. A number of Western European countries intend a role of bastion for Hungary, but we cannot accept that. We will also need financial aid; good advice is not enough for us because we do not even know

whether to expect a flood of refugees of one, two, or 10 million people from the Soviet Union....

[Varga] Minister Kiss, did you also conduct bilateral or multilateral negotiations?

[Kiss] Yes, I did. With my Japanese colleague for example, I spoke about the advantages for us of employing Hungarian workers at their capital investments. They agreed because the Japanese are willing to retrain workers to their requirements, even in masses. We also held tripartite talks with the labor ministers of the CSFR and Poland, and we agreed that, although Hungary is ahead of them in the establishment of the legal and institutional system of employment policy, we will have to adopt a joint stand in the future. One reason is that it is good if the West can see that there is accord between the three countries, and the other is that we cannot advance to Europe against each other.

[Varga] Europe will be unified soon, and penetrable for the member states in respect of the labor market. However, we only have a bilateral employment agreement with Germany at the moment.

[Kiss] We talked about setting up these contingents at several bilateral meetings; in my view, a unified Europe cannot go without these kinds of relations. Of course, some people question the importation of labor into countries that struggle with unemployment themselves. The case of Ireland is a good example to the contrary, where unemployment is at 19 percent. We still have constructive relations with them; they show a great interest toward us, and it is likely that we can sign an agreement similar to the German agreement in the near future. We also have good relations with England, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Belgium. I am convinced that we need offensive foreign relations for our labor policy. Obviously, we have to turn our wishes into words; otherwise, it would be hard to assist us.

[Varga] You mentioned the rate of unemployment in Ireland. We might not be as far as that yet, but I think this is also becoming a permanent problem for the Hungarian economy. In your view, how can this be handled most effectively?

[Kiss] Unemployment is a new illness for us, a great burden, and a considerable psychological pressure for the whole society. The level of unemployment is near 4 percent now, and it is growing fast, but it is not yet endangering the ability of our economy to function. The rate of increase has slowed down recently due to the large amount of seasonal work, especially in agriculture, but the autumn will be hard. I can see two encouraging factors. One is that the county employment centers are starting to find their role, namely they chart the unfilled jobs, and they maintain contact with each other. The other factor is that this current unemployment is due to the recession; thereforem, it is temporary and, according to our hopes, when our economy starts to grow, this unemployment will turn into structural unemployment. This means that certain sectors of our economy will regress and others will start to progress. The opportunities of our ministry will also expand, and our work might become more active because we will know what the directions of retraining should be and which professions have a growing demand. Unemployment is inherent in every market economy, but I would like to stress that this state of affairs can only be permanent for the economy; it has to be temporary in the life of an individual.

Foreign Minister Jeszenszky on CSCE Results

LD2506181491 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 0630 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Interview with Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky by Jozsef P. Szabo, upon his return from Berlin CSCE foreign ministers conference, in Budapest; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Szabo] It is not a military attack but economic problems that in fact threaten Europe today, even from the aspect of security. I believe Geza Jeszenszky mentioned this in his speech introducing a discussion [at the CSCE conference]:

[Jeszenszky] It is well known that at present the key question in Hungary and in other former communist countries is economic transformation. The success of this is guaranteed in the longer term, in my opinion, but the people's patience is limited. So it is not the same whether the success of the transformation can be felt in 10 years or in two to three years. Foreign Minister Genscher gave a warning example as an answer to the topic he addressed himself. He said that in Germany there was an historic moment when politicians with democratic views continued very sharp political disputes with each other, and during this dispute, the German economy collapsed and, as a result, German democracy collapsed, too. I feel that Genscher and many other politicians realize that we Hungarians, and the people of the other countries in the area too, must draw the conclusion that political debates must not be allowed to jeopardize economic transformation.

[Szabo] However, it was not an economic conference. Did a theory develop on how the economic recovery of Eastern and Central Europe can take place?

[Jeszenszky] I can say that, even if an economic program does result from the closing document, it was not only present in the speeches, but several people spoke of various programs. I see a realistic possibility that it will be the central issue of the next CSCE conference in Prague in January.

[Szabo] Does our approach to the European Community, to the Common Market, seem more promising in light of Berlin, or does it seem the same as before?

[Jeszenszky] It does seem more promising. I had a bilateral meeting with the U.S. secretary of state, who said—obviously not on the basis of his impressions but on the basis of experts' reports—that in their view the

possibility is that in Hungary, in fact, they can see the prospect that economic transformation will be successful within a short time. This is, in fact, the precondition of our joining the European Community. My counterparts expressed this not only informally, but Foreign Minister Genscher stated publicly during a discussion that the EC consists of 12 members but that it will not be this way for long. [passage indistinct]

I must say that everyone knows clearly how very important the continuation of the changes in the Soviet Union and its success are from the viewpoint of the future of Europe. Everyone knows its difficulties as well. It is also important that the Soviet leadership knows this too. They are looking for a form of cooperation that could guarantee that, in addition to trust, the economic cooperation should help the Soviet Union to take this extremely difficult step.

Jeszensky on Independence, SFRY Conflict

LD2106202591 Budapest MTI in English 1552 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 21 (MTI)—"We must be aware that independence should rely on cooperation between the East Central European countries, which are now free," Hungarian Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky said in the latest issue of the Polish weekly "POLITYKA."

Concerning the conflict in Yugoslavia, Jeszenszky said: "It would be a tragic development for Hungary and Europe as a whole if a civil war broke out in our southern neighbour. Furthermore, the ethnic map of that country is so diverse that an eventual armed conflict would only aggravate the crisis and solve nothing."

As far as Hungary's relationship with the Soviet Union is concerned, Jeszenszky said:

"With the pull-out of Soviet troops, Hungary has regained its full sovereignty, making it possible for the two countries to cooperate on a new basis...Our country will by no means endanger the security of the Soviet Union."

The Hungarian foreign minister emphasized the importance of Hungarian-Polish cooperation within the Hexagonale (the former Pentagonale) and the Polish-Czechoslovak-Hungarian relationship, and shared Finance Minister Mihaly Kupa's view on the need for free trade between the latter three countries.

Walesa Signs Senate Electoral Law

LD2506030491 Warsaw PAP in English 2149 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 24—President Lech Walesa on Monday signed the electoral bill to the Senate, which thus has become a law. Under the law 100 senators are to be elected by a majority vote on a province-constituency basis.

Three senators are to be elected in Warsaw and Katowice Provinces while two in the remaining ones.

The election to the Senate—according to the Electoral Law—will be held under appropriate provisions of the Sejm (lower house) Electoral Law and together with elections to the Sejm. This is why the Senate Electoral Law can be applied only after the Sejm Electoral Law becomes effective.

Walesa Visits Precision Tools Factory

LD2506175391 Warsaw PAP in English 1713 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Warsaw, June 25—Polish President Lech Walesa paid a visit to the "VIS" precision tools factory here on Tuesday [25 June] and had a meeting with the crew during which he presented a slightly softened opinion on the dissolution of the Parliament.

"It is not so easy to dissolve Parliament. The building of democracy requires a sensible attitude. I do not rule out anything. We will discuss a few more things and I will make such a move which will serve Poland," he said and stressed he would do everything to change the Parliament very quickly but without causing anarchy.

"I will not harm democracy but I will show firm attitude where it is necessary," Walesa stressed. Asked about his planned visit to Moscow, the Polish president said he had asked four questions and had said he would go provided he got the answers. "But so far, answers from Moscow have not come," he said. Referring to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland, the president said it was necessary to "be firm but at the same time sensible," and added that one should take into account all the aspects of the issue.

At the end of the meeting the president asked who was for the dissolution of the Parliament. About a half of the gathering raised their hands. "A little less," Walesa opined, apparently referring to his Sunday's [23 June] meeting with residents of Gdansk. However, no hands went up when he asked who was for maintaining the present Parliament.

Remarks on Dissolving Sejm

LD2506211191 Warsaw TVP Television Network in Polish 1730 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Just before the end of the first shift President Lech Walesa arrived at the VIS factory in Warsaw. During a meeting in the conference hall, he replied to employees' questions. The people were interested most of all in the president's attitude toward the present Parliament:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] How much longer will you let that Parliament function, even though all Poles feel that Parliament is working to the detriment of the nation?

[Walesa] Ladies and gentlemen, regardless [word indistinct] it does not conform to the principles it declares. It is imposed, it is enforced, because at that roundtable there, which was an achievement, we were forced to reach undemocratic solutions. Bear in mind, however, that we were the first, and that probably without those agreements we wouldn't be here today and I certainly wouldn't be president.

However, they have survived, and thus we must depart from it as quickly as possible. Not because it will be a better Parliament—it may be worse—but because it will have the right even to cite you, the authority, because it is freely elected. Even as I say, worse, but with authority. This one does not really have authority. I will do everything to achieve this as quickly [passage indistinct] we have not got enough. After all, we have a lot of (?pressures), we have many uncertainties, and then people play such a game to increase your uncertainty. As a result I am drawing conclusions from all the talks. I will choose the variant that you suggest—I am being told all sorts of things—and I will do things so as not to damage democracy. But sometimes decisiveness must be shown, because I was elected by the nation and it makes its demands on me. I know about this.

Many people say I was being manipulative outside St. Brygida's. I'll do this, although you have told me not to. (?I wanted to say I didn't want to talk about the Sejm—God, I've had enough of it!) But how many of you really want to dissolve the Sejm? Raise your hands. Let me convince myself. A little less. Thank you. How many are there to let things go on as they are? So no one wants to leave it as it is, and there must be changes.

However, I have convinced [word indistinct] however to proceed legally, which is starting to yield results. Now what conclusions can I draw? Well, by treating everyone seriously, by talking, by proving by argument, that our society is capable of drawing conclusions and capable of joining in. [end recording]

On Retribution, Moscow Trip

LD2506214891 Warsaw TVP Television Network in Polish 1753 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] President Lech Walesa has kept his word and has started his journey throughout Poland. Just before the end of the first shift he arrived at the Warsaw VIS precision engineering factory. After being shown around the machine hall, the president met with the work force.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] Some people are very dissatisfied with what is happening in our

country: If we are all to bear the burden equally, let's bear it equally. Unfortunately, they were all thieves, all those people who were at the helm and in the government; and now the present government is still protecting them. I'm thinking of the Sekulas and the Urbans; the former prime minister for not a full year, who came in torn clothes and drove away in a beautiful car and in a beautiful suit and who is traveling around the world sowing propaganda regarding the homeland. When will you settle all these people, sir, because it can't go on like this? You say you haven't the power and the authority. Make the proper decree; put people in jail and then we will applaud you for making right prevail by law and democracy...[words indistinct drowned by applause]

[Walesa] Ladies and gentlemen, you have touched on—I won't answer head on, but I'll come from a bit of an angle—you have touched on the basic problem: What do I, in fact, have the authority to do? I thought myself that this process would be a little longer; that there wouldn't be such a quick charge and at a certain point, at the roundtable, I limited the president's possibilities to the maximum. [sentence as heard]

But it appears that I have limited the possibilities for myself. Now, in fact, I have no rights except to designate a prime minister. I will extend this arrangement. I will bring everyone to account. I will do it, but I have no strength or means. I have no people to do it. I have no people, as even the unemployed keep wandering around, but they do not come to join the police force. People are not joining all these organizations of control. It is true that all those who were governing not so long ago have good pensions, cars, and even bodyguards today. But everything was introduced democratically.

I have a difficult choice. Should I be loyal to what you have granted me the right to do? You gave me the right to pluralism, to respect, and to respect the law. Or should I try to bend it slightly? I said lightly on Sunday [23 June] in Father Jankowski's church that I had a difficult choice, and I did not know if I would have to avail myself [of extra powers]. Look what is happening today; look what a scolding I get. I am not afraid. However, I want to tell you that you must decide whether we can improve the law, in accordance with the principles, and whether we can govern ourselves when we are free. These are the questions. Again, whether a resolute fellow like Walesa will take... [changes thought] but remember how it was.

I watched and read a little about the communists. At the outset they talked nicely. Of course, some of them came with tanks, but those coming from the masses thought well anyway. Someone tried to interfere, so first they sacked him, next they arrested him, and if he did not want to listen they went even further. Everyone is more or less joining in such a routine. That is why democracy and pluralism are a kind of protection against the abuse of power. Because we are building a democracy we should keep ourselves within the principles, the principles and organizational regulations.

Until I have no right I cannot violate the law. I do not like it. Sometimes my heart bleeds, but I cannot because I must not. Every revolution has its cost. Our revolution does not shoot, does not set fire, but it still costs, it costs you suffering a wrong, it costs bad laws, it costs swindles. We could assume it was going to cost. But how much, and will those who deceived us pay?

And when? And when? At the right time; and I believe it is still the time. We will safeguard the time legally and organizationally. When we go together, everything will fall into place for us, for no one for the time being [words indistinct] us, they didn't prepare us for ruling. We allowed ourselves to be outplayed by some smart guys who went from politics to economics, divided up, took their share and thought they'd won. I say to them: No! But for them to have been able to manage that, the Sejm that existed at that time... [changes thought] We wouldn't have thought at all of changes as great as the ones we have made. We don't see that really there has been a total reorientation on all subjects—clumsily, not the way it should have been done, not quickly, that's true, but we have totally changed one of the most difficult systems without a shot. But there must be continuation. [passage indistinct]

When am I going to Moscow? Gentlemen, gentlemen, here again, the idea was bad from the outset. I said many times that we can't say that those troops will run away and we'll chase them, we'll throw them out. No. With the concept with which we are winning and will win, we will show that troops of this kind and stationed here are only a loss, only an expense, and no defense. That's what Iraq and the other wars showed: that that's not how you fight today. So, that's why I said: Gentlemen, neighbors, it's bad for you and it's bad for us. Furl your sails as quick as you can, for we won't throw you out, we are doomed to you. But for crying out loud, pack up and go, because you're in our way.

When will I be going to the Soviet Union? Ladies and gentlemen, I made four demands, or four topics, to which I must (?have) an answer. I don't know if I can recall rightly—some time has passed since then—I said at the end: Gentlemen, if you have an answer on those topics of interest to Poland, then I'll be on my way immediately; if not, there's no reason for me to go. Why? It's a waste of your money and ours, my time and yours. I think that for the time being there's no answer to all those questions, or else they are so busy with reforms that they can't cope. [end recording]

There was also a question on reprivatization.

[Begin recording] [Walesa] Sir, how it is to be done? Normally. Give as much as possible [word indistinct] back to the citizens. They will do it privately. But, here again, how to do it?

That plot with the Belweder on it, no, not the Belweder, the Palace of Culture that they laughed about, the one I talked about in the United States, it's an easy plot. You heard about it, for I spoke about it publicly. What's to be

done when it turns out that—the Russians didn't ask, nor did our builders—they put the Palace of Culture on a private plot of land? Well, this now has to be returned, but the man says: I don't want the Palace of Culture. So how do we return it to him? How do we dismantle it? It's so very difficult that it will be impossible to achieve this painlessly.

I asked the people responsible for reprivatization: Sirs, let's have a general rule—anyone with a grievance reports it by the end of this year, (?bring them all). Whoever doesn't manage on time, tough. Nothing can be done. Then you can examine them, and when you have decided what doesn't clash, add things up and try to give back to people. It's impossible within half a year? Well, half a year, and within this half-year, [words indistinct] the government yet.

Ladies and gentlemen, let no one joke. Running the country is really difficult. Jesus, (?what a mess can be made). It means to serve, to help, and I will most certainly do all that I have to.

[Unidentified speaker, shouting] President, why do you need that whistle?

[Walesa] Because I thought they would whistle me down, so I wanted, just in case, to defeat them and then to talk to them.

[Speaker] They didn't whistle.

[Walesa] They didn't whistle.

[Speaker] Were you pleased with this meeting?

[Walesa] Yes. [end recording]

Defense Vice Minister on Links With USSR

AU2206202191 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 19 Jun 91 p 6

[Interview with Janusz Onyszkiewicz, vice minister of national defense, by Maria Wagrowska, place and date not given: "One Cannot Count On Providence Alone"]

[Text] [Wagrowska] It has been decided to convene a meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee in Prague in late June or early July to dissolve the entire pact. Czechoslovakia has suggested 1 July for this meeting. Will the meeting really take place on that date?

[Onyszkiewicz] It looks like it will. The preparations for it are in full swing, but it is not yet known at what level this last Political Consultative Committee meeting will be held. Several possibilities are being considered, including the participation of presidents. In that case, President Walesa would go to Prague. Neither is it known whether President Gorbachev is prepared to attend.

[Wagrowska] So a "summit" of Central and Eastern European leaders is possible. Will they just shake hands and say goodbye, or will they discuss something else?

[Onyszkiewicz] They will meet just to say goodbye. I know of no other plans. We are now formulating security policy based on a new concept and new structure. The attempts recently made by Romania to restore political cooperation among the countries still in the Warsaw Pact have failed completely.

[Wagrowska] And the Soviet Union is not applying any pressure?

[Onyszkiewicz] I do not think so, because the Soviet Union has made it reasonably clear that it wants to establish its security not on the basis of a new multilateral pact, but on bilateral treaties. It expressed this intention by concluding a treaty with Romania, which it wants to serve as a pattern. This is illustrated in the various proposals concerning treaties that the Soviet Union has addressed to Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

[Wagrowska] Let us talk about the Polish-Soviet treaty that is currently under discussion. They say it is meant to contain a security clause, but nothing about an alliance. What would that mean in practice?

[Onyszkiewicz] We are ready to declare, on the principle of reciprocity, our desire to prevent the use of, or rather refuse permission for the use of, our territory for any aggression against the Soviet Union.

[Wagrowska] I beg your pardon, but does that mean Poland would ban Western bases and armed forces from its territory?

[Onyszkiewicz] The pact would not contain any obligations that go beyond the ones I have already mentioned. It does not mean that we are planning to deploy foreign forces on our territory.

In the pact with the Soviet Union we would like to refer in addition to the generally accepted principles contained in the Helsinki Final Act, and especially in the Paris New Europe Charter. These principles are giving international relations a clear countenance. That ought to be enough for this pact to be a genuine pact of good-neighborly relations.

The Soviet Union has presented to Poland the draft of a treaty similar to the one already concluded with Romania, in which, as we know, the two sides mutually declare that neither side will enter any pact directed against the other. We do not want to agree to any such clause, mainly because this commitment is already contained in the New Europe Charter and there is no point in repeating it.

[Wagrowska] To what extent is military cooperation with the USSR possible? Such a clause is contained in the Romanian-Soviet treaty concluded on 5 April, but it has been criticized by some countries.

[Onyszkiewicz] We already have such cooperation and wish to continue it, of course. In any case, it is necessary because we have a large amount of Soviet military

hardware. We have to send it to the Soviet Union to be inspected and overhauled. Perhaps it is a good idea to use Soviet training areas and arrange training for our soldiers there. Perhaps we will receive new Soviet equipment. It is worth getting acquainted with Soviet military technology and thinking; after all, it is a country with enormous experience in military operations and large-scale exercises. In view of that, we want to send our military cadets to train in Soviet military academies.

All this does not mean that the cooperation is meant to be the same as in the past, and be based on the same principles. There is no longer any cooperation at all concerning the exchange of information, including aviation matters. There is no question of allied cooperation, which applies to all the other countries as well.

[Wagrowska] But the Soviet Union allegedly wants to preserve some of its logistics and communications in Poland. Can you deny that?

[Onyszkiewicz] Yes. Neither the treaty nor the talks on the withdrawal of Soviet troops mention this. Nevertheless, the communications system will remain inasmuch as it is difficult to rip the cables out of the soil. That would serve no purpose. But of course there is no question of preserving any of the infrastructure which the Soviet Union might be able to use in the future. In any case, the Soviet Union is not making any such demand.

[Wagrowska] You have made it clear that Poland will not allow the deployment of foreign forces on its territory. We know that Poland is not trying to join NATO. But would you not like to see cooperation more far-reaching than the sort which NATO offered to Poland and the other Central and Eastern European countries in Copenhagen on 6 June?

[Onyszkiewicz] What NATO has declared is merely a general framework which must be filled with concrete substance. I think it is now necessary to consider the possibilities of cooperation, compare them with our needs and limited financial possibilities, and choose what is suitable. I even fear we will be unable to take advantage of all the opportunities that are opening up before us, one reason for this being our officer corps' ignorance of foreign languages.

But regardless of NATO, we want to cooperate with individual countries, including the countries that are politically closest to us right now, i.e. Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

[Wagrowska] You have no greater expectations from NATO?

[Onyszkiewicz] I think the Copenhagen declaration meets our expectations halfway. That does not mean the situation should be considered "frozen" for the next 10 or 15 years. Perhaps the development of events will bring new possibilities of cooperation, but right now I do not have any higher demands to make.

[Wagrowska] From the point of view of the external aspects of Poland's security, i.e. shunning the use of force and the deployment of our Army, can we consider ourselves safe?

[Onyszkiewicz] I think we can. The threat of a major war in Europe is very distant now. The rise of democracy in Europe has reduced the danger of war as a political tool. Although this does not rule out the possibility of conflicts, these conflicts would be limited.

[Wagrowska] The CSCE session in Berlin on 19 and 20 June is supposed to create effective mechanisms for preventing conflicts. What is Poland's concept?

[Onyszkiewicz] The threat of conflict has been very considerably reduced by disarmament agreements because these agreements have thinned the forces surrounding our borders and created a wide array of confidence and security-building measures, such as on-the-spot inspections, and perhaps aerial inspections in the near future (the "open skies" program). Poland would like to consolidate all these trends.

I would also consider the initiative of Ministers Baker and Genscher important. It boils down to the following: If any country thinks that the principles of the Paris Charter are being violated or a potential hotbed of conflicts or tension is being formed, it may apply to convene a CSCE conference provided a few other countries support this application. That is a very important initiative, because if the idea of departing from the principle of consensus in such a situation had not been presented, a CSCE conference might never come about because the offending country would simply veto it. But I think a rule should have been adopted requiring the support of a large number of countries for such an application, though not compulsory support by so-called important countries, for that would merely lead to a new kind of Security Council.

The debate on military doctrines also plays an important role in the process of building confidence. If these doctrines turn out to be based on the same values and general principles, it will encourage European security.

[Wagrowska] You and a few other Polish politicians have said you would like to alter the mandate of the Vienna talks, so that defense potential would be geared more closely to factors like the population of a given country, its size, and the length of its borders.

[Onyszkiewicz] That is an exceedingly important matter. So far the Vienna talks have been concerned with preserving the balance between the two military blocs concerning basic types of weapons. That was relatively easy, because it was to be achieved by a straightforward weapons reduction to the same numerical level on both sides. But now that the two blocs have been replaced by a multilateral system, one cannot apply the old criteria. We have already encountered this problem while negotiating the numerical distribution of weapons among the Warsaw Pact countries. There were simply no criteria to

serve as a basis. In the end we succeeded, but it was almost a miracle we did so. In future it is better not to count on Providence, and possess suitable criteria instead—criteria of defense sufficiency. In addition, one should consider introducing to the disarmament talks more topics than just basic categories of weapons and the size of the permanent armed forces, which is variable because of the military reserve. The quality of armaments should also be considered to a certain extent, not just the quantity.

Interior Minister on Covert Operations

AU2506073391 Warsaw SZTANDAR MLODYCH in Polish 21-23 Jun 91 p 3

[Interview with Interior Minister Henryk Majewski by Robert Walenciak, place and date not given: "I Will Not Divulge"]

[Text] [Walenciak] For 40 years the Interior Ministry was the armed phalanx of the Communist Party. Of all the ministries of the Polish People's Republic, it was the one with the closest links to the party. The opposition demanded its depoliticization. How is this being carried out?

[Majewski] I do not know of any ministry employee belonging to any political group. There are cases of policemen being members of local government councils, but this is a result of their social mandate. As far as the ministry is concerned, political activity is out of the question.

[Walenciak] So when you hire a new employee...

[Majewski] ...I warn him he must leave his political career behind. He must declare himself apolitical when he comes to work here.

[Walenciak] When you said there would be no witch hunts in the ministry, did you mean that the ministry is already clean?

[Majewski] The expression "witch hunt" comes from the fact that whenever a political upheaval occurs in Poland, there is a hunt for those responsible. My statement had nothing to do with a witch hunt. What I meant was that anyone in the ministry currently undergoing assessment should be assessed not just according to his qualifications.

[Walenciak] If someone has passed his screening, do you consider him clean?

[Majewski] If he has passed his screening, it means he is trustworthy and has been given a chance in life. After all, the Solidarity press also employs journalists who used to be on the other side of the barricades. How are they in Solidarity now? The situation in the ministry is exactly the same.

[Walenciak] Justice Minister Chrzanowski has demanded that all candidates for Sejm deputy be screened in case any of them used to cooperate with the Interior Ministry. What is your view on this subject?

[Majewski] I said at the very beginning that I would not divulge any information, and I think it quite impossible for the Interior Ministry to fulfill the role Minister Chrzanowski wants it to fulfill. I am very much against the implementation of such ideas.

[Walenciak] Which Security Service [SB] functions are now part of the sphere of interests of the Office for the Protection of the State [UOP]?

[Majewski] None, as far as the SB as we know it, people from the other side of the barricades, are concerned. But, objectively speaking, the situation of the intelligence, counterintelligence, and surveillance sections of the SB was very odd, because of the previous authorities. Nowadays, for objective reasons, the UOP contains the intelligence, counterintelligence, and investigations-surveillance sections, so these three sections are still the most important ones. However they did not have, or should not have had, anything to do with the work of Departments 3, 4, 5, and 6, in other words, the departments responsible for combating the opposition and clergy.

[Walenciak] Department 4 of the ministry possessed a Section D (Diversion), responsible for keeping tabs on the clergy. Did other ministry departments have equivalent bodies?

[Majewski] There were separate cells which dealt with various things, according to the situation. They were set up in addition to existing ones.

[Walenciak] Was Section D permanent or temporary?

[Majewski] It is difficult to call it temporary. It was set up for a specific purpose.

[Walenciak] You said the ministry will not reveal rings of agents. To what extent is a former SB ring working for the UOP?

[Majewski] The SB ring is considered a group of spies, whereas I am talking about secret collaborators who were recruited in various ways in order to cooperate with the militia or SB. It is not quite true that all those who collaborated then are collaborating today. It depends on the situation.

[Walenciak] Deputy Cimoszewicz has accused the Foreign Ministry of monitoring his meetings with members of the Belorussian ethnic minority. Did the UOP pass some of its duties to the Foreign Ministry?

[Majewski] I think you should ask the Foreign Ministry.

[Walenciak] In that case I have a question which Foreign Minister Skubiszewski told me to ask you. Skubiszewski refused to say whether or not Poland has abolished its spy ring in the United States, and told us to ask the Interior Ministry.

[Majewski] If I were to declare that spy rings have been abolished, it would be a very sweeping declaration. But I can tell you that we are not preparing any new mechanisms for activity against another state.

[Walenciak] One of the functions of our intelligence service was to investigate our trade and industrial partners. We hear, however, that there are firms with enormous capital operating on the Polish market about whom the state authorities have absolutely no information whatsoever. Do you consider that normal?

[Majewski] It is not normal. But someone gives these firms permission to operate in Poland. It is certainly not the UOP. One should ask the officials in the offices that grant this permission.

[Walenciak] One of your subordinates, the deputy chief of the UOP, said recently that Poland has become an area of intensified activity by foreign intelligence services, but no one has yet heard of a foreign agent being arrested. Do we still have a counterintelligence program?

[Majewski] The activity of special services is one thing, but the gathering of information which could be used by foreign firms entering the Polish market is another thing. There are various philosophies behind the work of special services. Normally, every intelligence or counterintelligence service wants to extract as much information as possible out of a given person, if that information is required. Court cases are the end result.

[Walenciak] Until the system changed, our special services cooperated with the KGB.

[Majewski] What do you mean by "cooperated"?

[Walenciak] There was a KGB resident in Poland, and...

[Majewski] If the KGB was inside various ministries and state structures, it had no need to extract information from special services. It was everywhere. It came, went, and visited whatever it wanted to. Cooperation is a conscious offer of information, and we cannot speak of that, because KGB representatives did not require it. They obtained everything they wanted without our special services.

[Walenciak] Have we established an intelligence network in the USSR?

[Majewski] I suppose you expect me to give you names and addresses. I can neither confirm nor deny that.

[Walenciak] Polish intelligence and counterintelligence officers are currently undergoing training in the United States. What do we get from that? Do we know how much Western intelligence services know about Polish security structures?

[Majewski] In the United States we are training people to combat terrorism and drugs, and that is the most important thing right now. Apart from that, those countries are the only ones that have opened themselves to us and allow us to avail ourselves of their equipment and experience. As far as the training of intelligence or counterintelligence is concerned, we are trying to learn about training methods so that we can use them in Poland.

[Walenciak] Some posts in the UOP are staffed by former members of the pacifist organization "Freedom and Peace," whose main principle was a refusal to undergo military service. How are they adapting to their new environment?

[Majewski] I think that if anyone decides to work for the UOP, especially those who were opposed to the former system, he does so for patriotic reasons and because of a certain predisposition. In any case, this work is very interesting. I think they are adapting well, seeing that they are working.

[Walenciak] The Confederation for an Independent Poland [KPN] said recently that it had discovered an SB subversion ring in Silesia, and the UOP confirmed the discovery of unlicensed weapons. Does that mean the KPN has better information sources than the UOP?

[Majewski] This information, which was publicly announced by the KPN, was exaggerated.

[Walenciak] Are you pleased that the KPN is trying to do your ministry's work with such gusto?

[Majewski] If that is part of their statutory activity...

[Walenciak] Does it not bother you?

[Majewski] No.

[Walenciak] In every country, an efficient interior ministry has a list of potential enemies of the system. How long is your ministry's list?

[Majewski] We do not have one because the democratic changes in Poland provide no indication whatsoever of who opposes the system. All that is already behind us, the entire communist era.... How many political groups are there in Poland? Two hundred? One thousand? How are we to detect enemies of the system in such a great number?

[Walenciak] Some newspapers are writing about a plot of postcommunist forces who want to bring back the old order.

[Majewski] The press can say what it likes.

[Walenciak] Thank you for the interview.

Territorial Claims on Bulgaria Denied

AU2506202791 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1844 GMT 25 Jun 91

["Statement by Foreign Ministry Spokesman"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 25/6/1991—Commenting on the June 24 address made by Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase to the Romanian Parliament, some mass media in Bulgaria allege that the Romanian minister "accused" Bulgaria of having occupied a part of the Romanian territory, shows a statement by the Foreign Ministry spokesman conveyed to the national news agency ROMPRES. Also, the statement mentions, the chief editor of Radio Horizon, Mr. Martin Minchev, asked the Romanian press attache in Sofia: "How would you comment on Minister Nastase's statement that Bulgaria occupied a part of the Romanian territories as a result of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and does this mean that Romania has territorial claims on Bulgaria?"

About all this, the Foreign Ministry spokesman shows, I want to stress that Minister Adrian Nastase's address only presented historical facts as they were. No part of the address contains any accusation of Bulgaria, and the least so may one speak of Romanian territorial claims on Bulgaria. The words were carefully chosen in the historical survey, the minister referred to the "tearing off of a part of Transylvania and the loss of southern Dobrogea," which rigorously corresponds to historical facts.

As for the idea of territorial claims, I want to recall the point clearly made by the foreign minister in the same address to the Parliament: "We can understand the emotional approaches of certain political forces in our country, but we do not share them, since their immediate implication is to come up with territorial claims on Bessarabia and the Romanian territories as were in 1940. Such an approach is not in the spirit of the above principles—it is about the principles in the UN Charter, the declaration of the General Assembly on the principles of friendly inter-state relations and those included in the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter—moreover, it is both utopian and contraproductive, both politically and in actual fact." If this stands applies to Bessarabia, it applies the more so as the southern part of Dobrogea is concerned, shows the Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement.

Press on Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact Statement

AU2506123291 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1118 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 25/6/1991—The Bucharest dailies comment in their Tuesday issues [on] a declaration on the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact enacted by the Parliament of Romania the previous day.

The mass circulation daily "ADEVARUL" assesses the declaration as a "necessary, if late, reparation" which gives "official clothing to a sentiment that all Romanians (and not only they) have been living with for over five decades: The injustice and wrong-doing, hence the legal nullity, of an international understanding that retraced the map of the old continent to suit the will of two dishonest dictators and brought an ocean of suffering and blood to the peoples living in this part of the world."

Commenting on the speech made in parliament by Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase on that theme, "ADEVARUL" notes the "balanced value judgments and especially the fact that the present and future political options were made after a lucid appraisal of the realities."

In its turn, "ROMANIA LIBERA," the largest circulation opposition daily, points to the "solemn character and significance of the meeting that enacted the declaration.

On the Romanian foreign minister's speech, the same daily assesses it as "an unforgettable day" when "eternal truths of our history were heard—after many decades of oppressive and forced silence—under the dome of the highest representative forum of the country." On the "policy of small steps" referred to by Romanian dignitaries, the daily winds up: "We are still waiting for a more convincing policy—that of decisive steps."

Leadership Strategy on 'Parallel' Parties Noted

AU2606095891 Bucharest DREPTATEA in Romanian 20 Jun 91 p 3

[T. Alexandru article: "The Romanian Surprise"]

[Text] When the scenarios started to unfold in Eastern Europe, a completely unpredicted event took place in our country: The historical parties revived from their own ashes. The entrance of the National Peasant Christian-Democratic Party [PNT-CD], the National Liberal Party [PNL], and the Social Democratic Party [PSD] into the political arena meant a blow "below the belt" to the communists who called themselves reformers. Certainly according to the Moscow model!

In the other countries of the socialist "camp", the "traditional" communist parties—compromised both on the internal and external plane—unexpectedly gave up power easily to parties created in great haste, that were more democratic and even with a liberal tinge, but led by many communists. The major cause that generated the "rotation of cadres," and even the sacrifice of others, was the economic collapse. As a result of the superficial changes, the authors of scenarios anticipated a massive transfer of foreign currency and new technology from the West toward the East. This is the materialization of the new economic order about which Nicolae Ceausescu was constantly telling us and the whole world. We should not believe that the paranoiac Ceausescu was able to predict, but somebody "up there" asked him to act like one. Today, to a certain extent, the "human faced aspect" has gained the upper hand. The scenario has finally succeeded. Under the false slogan

"Down with communism!," the capital of the rich started to penetrate the poor countries of East Europe, even if it does not reach expected levels for the time being.

As could be expected, Romania also joined the "dance." Only in our case, we needed to make adjustments "on the move." Many smaller and larger parties shot up like mushrooms after the rain next to the hybrid National Salvation Front [FSN]. But all of them wholeheartedly support the imposed "ideals." The only thorns in the disguised program of the neocommunists are the PNT-cd, the PNL, and the PSD (and lately the Antitotalitarian Forum as well). A great majority of the electorate understood quickly the maneuvers of those in power—which emerged through the "rotation of cadres"—and started to support fervently the historical parties, expecting a really new life. As a result, the leaders of communism "with a human face" launched a long line of attacks, some of them even violent, exactly against traditional parties. However, terror, lies, slander, disinformation, and physical aggression have not proved to be sufficient in the political struggle. Then those in power changed tactics and attempted large scale diversionist action, by artificially creating "parallel" political formations. That is how the Agrarian Democratic Party, as a virtual replacement for the PNT-cd, and the Neoliberal Movement, as a hope of liberalism, appeared instead of the PNL. The other historical party—the Social Democratic Party—was reserved as a "surprise" precisely from the FSN, which intended and still intends to become a "social democratic" party. However, the electorate did not rise to the "bait." Thus, the reformer communists were forced to change strategies again. The network of "trustworthy cadres"—infiltrated up to the level of the traditional party leadership—have been activated. Under various pretexts, some "young people" formed dissident groups and forced the split of the "old ones." The Independent PNT-cd detached itself from the PNT-cd proper and the PNL-Young Wing broke with the PNL. Even at the level of the PSD, a group "dissatisfied" with the attitude of the old members of the party currently are carrying out discreet negotiations with the representatives of the FSN. Thus, "parallel" parties again. The partial maneuver has succeeded. In turn, the tricked electorate is also split. The game of doubles has caught the press world as well. The leadership has financed the printing of certain "independent" publications that, without these permanent subventions, would be bankrupt. On the other hand, the truly independent publications have been stifled through deliberately faulty distribution.

At the time when "parallel" parties and diversionist publications appeared, the current neocommunist leadership did all it could to definitively compromise the market economy—by forcing inflation and false liberalization, by accentuating poverty and systematically encouraging profiteering. In the near future, the new communist parties with colorful names are to implement the long "dreamed of" new type of socialism. God forbid!

UDMR Sees 'Territorial Integrity' Threatened

AU2506113591 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0949 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 25/6/1991—Gathered on June 20, 1991 the Presidium of the Hungarian Democratic Union of Romania [UDMR] was perplexed to learn that the Chamber of Deputies approved, during the debates on the national security bill, a paragraph running counter to the constitutional thesis. The constitutional thesis assesses territorial separatism as an action adverse to the state. In the state security law this concept has been extended to the so-called segregationist separatism and to other forms of separatism which would put territorial integrity and state security into jeopardy. This wording creates the possibility of abusively interpreting the concept of separatism. That is why our parliamentary group voted against the law, a communique sent to ROMPRES reads.

The UDMR Presidium considers of major importance the restoration of the right of property over nationalized properties to the state of December 31, 1947, promotes complete and gradual privatisation. [sentence as received]

The communique also shows that the UDMR Presidium supports the protest strikes staged by trade unions.

'Exclusive' Interview With Former King Mihai

AU2306183191 Bucharest ROMANIA LIBERA in Romanian 18 Jun 91 pp 1, 4

[First part of "Exclusive Interview with ROMANIA LIBERA—King Mihai Opens His Heart" by Sorin Rosca-Stanescu—place and date not given; first two paragraphs are ROMANIA LIBERA introduction]

[Text] King Mihai chose a nondiplomatic way, as far as the reestablishment of monarchy is concerned, and maybe the only way toward the soul of the people: honesty and absolute frankness. His Majesty's answers might embarrass or even shock both the leadership and the opposition. For a person who has such a high ranking position, the simplicity of his answers is surprising. The refusal of King Mihai to get involved in politics is more than deliberate, and it is even the core of the institution that he represents. King Mihai is a referee. He fulfills a role from which he cannot abdicate. He is the monarch of all Romanians. This condition is both bolstering and humiliating at the same time because it makes him use a surprisingly simple and direct language, without sharp tones, hard lines, and false sparkles, which lack the subtly that characterizes a politician.

His wish to bring peace to Romania places him above the struggle for power and above confrontations and rivalry, conferring upon him the role of unifier. However, he has the attitude of a simple man, an attitude that stems from a deep knowledge and wisdom. During the interview, I tried to ask him all the questions that a misinformed, unhappy, and confused citizen might ask his monarch,

no matter that that person belongs to the National Salvation Front, National Liberal Party, Civic Alliance or other organization. He is a monarch usurped and exiled by communists, whose destiny is connected to the past, the present, and the future. Maybe mostly to the future.

[Stanescu] To what extent has a true belief in God put up a resistance in our country after so many decades of communism? What is, according to Your Majesty's opinion, the state of the Romanian people as far as religious belief is concerned?

[King Mihai] It is a painful issue. You remember—since it is impossible not to remember—that very few people in Romania opposed the destruction of churches. Maybe the fear was too great. The Romanians have always been believers and that is what they continue to be today. However, to a certain extent, they have moved away from the Orthodox Church precisely because of the poor resistance to communism that the Church showed in the past years.

[Stanescu] The Securitate took care to infiltrate the Church.

[King Mihai] It is certain that our churches in Europe and America or other parts of the world have felt attempts at Securitate infiltration. They were sent from Bucharest. They were Securitate agents wearing priests' cassocks. It is clear that the same thing happened in Romania as well. Nevertheless, people often kneel down and make the sign of the cross at the television building, in University Square, in Palace Square, and in many other places. One can easily read in people's eyes that they believe in God.

[Stanescu] In Romania, religious feelings have always been connected with trust in the monarch.

[King Mihai] Even before the constitutional monarchy, in the time of our kings, the church played an important role. Let us just think of Stefan the Great, who, fulfilling his vow, erected a church after each battle that he won.

[Stanescu] Your Majesty, what will your attitude toward the Orthodox Church be, and how will you relate to people's belief in God if you return to Romania's throne?

[King Mihai] People will be able to see how strong my belief is and how strong are the ties of the monarchy with the Church. I hope that this relation with God will also reach those who still have doubts.

[Stanescu] Are you a rich man?

[King Mihai] A strange question. No, simply I am not.

[Stanescu] How do you live? How have you lived through the years of exile?

[King Mihai] There are witnesses who know how I left and who can disavow all the propaganda and lies concocted by communists. A commission from Bucharest thoroughly searched all our luggage. We left in four cars with our own clothes.

[Stanescu] Did you have accounts abroad?

[King Mihai] No, never. I did not have a cent. But it is no less true that during his time, my father took out much from Romania, and that is why when Antonescu came to power he sequestered everything that was in the Royal Palace.... While I was the monarch, not a cent left Romania.

[Stanescu] You have a large family, you had duties toward your family. How did you manage?

[King Mihai] After the first two to three years, I was in an extremely difficult situation. The communists gave us 50,000 lei and 280,000 Swiss francs. We lived on this money for two years; then we moved to England where I worked in a vegetable and flower garden. I was selling the products in the village where we lived. I worked in the garden until 1954. Then we moved to Switzerland, and I was lucky to meet an American industrialist in the field of aviation. For two years, I was a pilot doing test and demonstration flights. After two years, I saved some money and together with some other pilots we set up a small electronics society in Geneva. After six or seven years, the competition defeated us. We had to stop our activity. Later, through my uncle, King Charles of Greece, I got in touch with Greek industrialists and started working for them; I was in charge of financial operations. I had to acquire a license in this area. That is how I lived... As you see, I am not rich. I live like any ordinary person in Switzerland.

[Stanescu] To what extent could your education and instruction, and the experience that you gained in those unhappy years, be useful to Romania?

[King Mihai] I have constitutional experience; I know well the mechanisms of democracy and constitutional monarchy. The years of exile were a tough and good school. I know the mentality in the so-called free world.

[Stanescu] Why the "so-called free" world?

[King Mihai] Because a 100 percent free world does not exist. After the war, the West has permanently lived in fear from the Soviets. This is not freedom. Arming is not freedom either.

[Stanescu] Among the democracies currently existing in the world, is there a country whose model could be used by us as well?

[King Mihai] The question is incorrect. Each country is unique. There are a few countries in West Europe, some constitutional monarchies, where things turned out well, even very well.

[Stanescu] How have you helped Romania through your actions during the 40 years of exile?

[King Mihai] This is a painful issue. Some people believe that I have done nothing in this respect. If those are people in good faith, they will understand what happened. If I call somebody on the phone and the line at the other end is cut suddenly, I continue to talk but I am disconnected. It was very difficult, sometimes even impossible, to approach governments in the free world. My apparent silence is due, to a great extent, to the reticent attitude of governments in the West. Although every year I sent messages to the BBC and Radio Free Europe, the press in democratic countries did not make them public. Before Ceausescu's "systematization" began, almost nobody wanted to listen to me.

[Stanescu] To what extent did you have contacts with the diaspora?

[King Mihai] As you know, there was a National Romanian Committee. Through this Committee, I received, more or less exact, but far from complete information about Romania. One should not forget that every member of this committee was struggling with difficulties to make a living. Then we had contact with members of the press and with many people living in exile.

[Stanescu] Did people who visited Switzerland try to contact you? Did they attempt to meet with you?

[King Mihai] Very few of them. They were afraid. There were many Securitate members among the exiles. The situation changed when the "systematization" began.

[Stanescu] Did anything change in the attitude of governments in the free world toward monarchy after 22 December 1989?

[King Mihai] Not immediately. Now there is a much greater understanding of the idea of constitutional monarchy in Romania.

[Stanescu] What advantages would your return to Romania bring to the country in the area of foreign policy or advantages in general?

[King Mihai] The essence of a constitutional monarch is to be completely above any politics, parties, and different currents, and to be detached from political or civilian forces, while a president is a party person. No matter how much he wants to, he cannot be neutral. A constitutional king has nothing to do with parties.

[Stanescu] If the monarchy returned to Romania, would the republics in the free world support Romania?

[King Mihai] Today Romania is discredited almost throughout the whole of the Western world. Maybe France is an exception, where they do not understand the core of the problem very well. The other countries do not view sympathetically what has happened from December until now. I believe that if radical changes took place in our country, if people regained their trust in the country's leadership and in the government, if a real democratization process began in Romania, and if freedoms were not hampered, the West would understand very quickly what is going on and we could benefit from substantial assistance.

[Stanescu] Would the other constitutional monarchies support Romania more if its king returned to the country?

[King Mihai] A constitutional monarchy can do only what its government decides. Only a change in the political line and in mentalities can provoke real changes in foreign relations.

SRI Chief Interviewed on Berevoiesti Case

AU2206172191 Bucharest LIBERTATEA in Romanian 17-18 Jun 91 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Professor Virgil Magureanu, director of the Romanian Intelligence Service, by Octavian Andronic; place and date not given: "'The Berevoiesti Effect' and Transparence!"]

[Text] [Andronic] Why was General Stan [not further identified] replaced? What was the official reason?

[Magureanu] As a matter of fact, one cannot answer this question by invoking official and less official reasons. General Stan's replacement is not necessarily linked to the "Berevoiesti case," as many journalists hastened to assert. The decision to replace him was anticipated long before the events we are talking about, so that one can say that his replacement is part of a longer process of organizational restructuring of our institution. General Stan will take over other duties.

[Andronic] You anticipated my second question, namely whether there was also an unofficial reason for this change.

[Magureanu] I do not deny that the aforementioned episode precipitated his replacement to a certain extent. However, it would be totally wrong and disloyal to make him responsible for what happened. Nobody can be exonerated from this responsibility, beginning with the director of the Romanian Information Service [SRI].

[Andronic] What consequences will the "Berevoiesti episode" have on the organization and functioning of the SRI?

[Magureanu] Paradoxically, in spite of fears that the consequences might be most damaging, we believe that the institution will stand to gain from it. I do not want to shock you with such answers, but I sincerely believe that the effects of this incident will be to enhance overall discipline on the one hand, and to clarify certain options regarding the function of and incentives for the new structures on the other. I would be very happy—and I want to emphasize this—if the public were correctly informed about the restructuring process within the SRI, that will be further accelerated by the Berevoiesti incident.

[Andronic] Should we understand that something good may also come out of this unsavory affair? Are you up to date with the first conclusions of the parliamentary inquiry commission?

[Magureanu] The inquiry has just started, and since I do not want to influence its progress in any way, I would rather skip this question.

[Andronic] What, in your opinion, should be done to completely eliminate Securitate-type residue from SRI activity? Such residue undoubtedly still exists.

[Magureanu] It does exist in such an institution, during such a difficult process as the transition from totalitarianism to democracy. Unfortunately, it cannot be eliminated just by removing certain people that are guilty of certain incidents or for their behavior during their careers... We are talking here about a drastic change of options, something that can only be done over a long period of time. On the other hand, this is going to be a most cumbersome process that we should not underestimate. It also implies gaining the public's trust in an intelligence institution that no longer has any repressive tasks to perform. Maybe the most difficult task will be to acquire this new image.

[Andronic] Do you think it is possible now to critically appraise the Securitate's activities and organizational system? When I talk about a critical appraisal, I am asking if there is anything good that could be possibly be retained.

[Magureanu] Such a critical appraisal, while obviously necessary, would unfortunately require much more space and time than this framework permits us. You ask whether there was anything positive in the activities of the former Securitate? Perhaps I am not the best person to answer such a question. Any institution whose goal is connected with ensuring national independence and stability must necessarily have something positive in its record. However, I would like to point out the terrible contortion that occurs in totalitarianism. In spite of various noble aims, the best intentions are corrupted in that context. Let us just recall the fact that, in the years of the Ceausescu regime, counterespionage activities, that are absolutely necessary for the existence of any state, seem to have been devoted entirely to promoting the interests of the clan in power! What a terrible mistake! That is why, at the beginning of this interview, I pointed out that, first of all we should restructure the institution's goals, in order to eventually be able to take from the previous activities what was good and compatible with the authentic national values.

[Andronic] You strongly denied—and rightly so, I think—any previous involvement in the activities of the Securitate. Did you ever have anything to do with it as the subject of an investigation?

[Magureanu] I cannot say that I did. Although I was the subject of increasingly greater attention in recent years, I was never approached or interrogated by the Securitate.

[Andronic] Still, were you never interested in finding out how much the Securitate knew about your life and activities?

[Magureanu] Oh, yes, although this is not really a priority. I have been and am still interested in this aspect. However—and this will probably be considered yet another diversion by the SRI chief—my file is among those that disappeared in the first days of the revolution. But I think that one can reconstruct the traces of that action.

[Andronic] The SRI was criticized for not catching a single spy. I know this is a pretty simplistic approach. Nevertheless, here is my question—was the SRI in a position to do such a thing and failed to do so?

[Magureanu] Indeed, this is a simplistic way of seeing things. Actually, we identified enough citizens engaged in espionage on our territory. In a few cases we have already drawn the attention of their employers, but in a discreet way. Generally speaking, I can say that people involved in espionage activities in our country are already under close surveillance.

[Andronic] Can one still talk about, well, human rights, in the case of spies?

[Magureanu] The discreet way in which we operated in this respect may be proof of rather scrupulous observation (maybe not always justified) of basic human rights. However, leaving aside all jokes—as this institution is not allowed to joke about human rights—the surveillance of these individuals was done by scrupulously observing all legal provisions.

[Andronic] Professor Magureanu, where exactly do you see the place of the institution you are leading in the framework of our state's power structures?

[Magureanu] This place is already beginning to take shape. At least at this stage, the institution's place is among those that—alongside the Ministry of the Interior, the Armed Forces, and the legal bodies—are defending national security. On the other hand, the SRI director is a member of the country's Supreme Defense Council. There is also another aspect—novel, in my opinion—that mostly relates to this sort of institution: We also have an amendment that has already been accepted, stipulating that the institution will operate under the direct control of Parliament.

[Andronic] How could one achieve such control from a technical viewpoint? The prospective commission will be made up of people selected more or less at random, with greater or lesser knowledge of this field. How can these people, given limited mandates yet having access to top secret information, not become liabilities and create delicate situations?

[Magureanu] One should not give a unilateral interpretation to this subordination. One can easily conceive of a commission made up of competent people—parliamentarians—doing a satisfactory job. They could direct and gradually specialize in matters pertaining to national defense. As a matter of fact, this is a natural and essential duty of the Parliament. On the other hand, why should one assume that Parliament cannot ensure this supervision and guidance, while other organizations, which I do not want to name now, are capable of doing it? The same question of competence and professionalism, as well as of inherent patriotism, equally applies to any of the state's other institutions.

[Andronic] How open could such an institution be, an institution that is berated (?!) [as published] for its more covert modes of operation? How far can openness go?

[Magureanu] There is no need to mince words here: It can be as open as any secret service can be! The SRI has a duty toward its barely-overcome past—from which we are parting so strenuously—to improve our public image and the quality of our institution's personnel. Quite aside from that, from the moment when we have a law firmly directing the institution's activity and Romania's democratic constitution has been promulgated, we will be able to discuss, even in detail, the conditions in which this institution must have open relations with the public, as well as the limits of and justification for this openness.

[Andronic] Who, in your opinion, is afraid of the SRI? Or, who should be afraid of it?

[Magureanu] In principle, no one should be afraid of it. Only those who intend to undertake questionable actions regarding our national security.

[Andronic] Do you relish the idea that your position offers you the opportunity for covert activities? There is indeed such a bias when people talk about this subject and you personally.

[Magureanu] On many occasions, for purposes of cheap publicity that I have never sought, some people tried to project an image of me as a man with covert concerns, who plots all kinds of diversionist actions in our society. In reality, all this is far from true. I believe there is nothing covert in my activity. The purpose of such a position is rather to supervise the observation of certain principles—no matter how prosaic this may sound. There are some aspects of this activity that require a certain amount of secrecy, at least until some cases are resolved. But this is something altogether different, and one should not interpret the keeping of secrets—some of which are matters pertaining to our national security—as a covert operation.

[Andronic] How do you appraise the two motions submitted to Parliament, which demand the inventory and sealing of the archives of the former Securitate and the creation of a joint intelligence commission?

[Magureanu] Such a motion was to be expected. I believe that it is one of the necessary steps for placing all these problems under the direct control of Parliament. This is just one of the steps. It should be properly considered, however. Concerning the sealing of archives and maintenance of strict control over how those documents are manipulated and by whom, this is an operation whose time has come, and I am sorry that it was not done sooner.

[Andronic] In this entire period, when the most far-fetched scenarios were considered, did you ferret out some that were later justified by the evolution of events?

[Magureanu] Too few. Indeed, many phantasmagoric scenarios were circulated, with the sole aim of deceiving the public and even the intelligence apparatus. However, there have also been a few scenarios that drew our attention and are being confirmed now by the evolution of current events.

[Andronic] Do you subscribe to the idea of the existence of a parallel secret Securitate?

[Magureanu] It seems that after the events of December 1989, several groups tried to organize such services of their own, with the aim of conducting illicit surveillance or obtaining unilateral advantages. Some of these groups conceived the aforementioned plots, while others have spread false rumors, all in order to deceive the public. Unfortunately, this is the truth.

[Andronic] What would you most like to do in the coming period?

[Magureanu] What I would most like to do is to return to my old profession, and I am sure that one day I will manage to do that.

Roman Addresses Meeting on Danube Cooperation

AU2506135391 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1305 GMT 25 Jun 91

["Interviews-Statements: Premier Roman: The Idea of a North-South Waterway Is Shaping Up"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 25/6/1991—Danube collaboration can and must become part of the joint effort to build future Europe, whose backbone it really is, Romanian Premier Petre Roman told a gathering of Danube countries' representatives which opened on Tuesday morning in Bucharest.

Speaking in his opening address of the initiative put forth by Romania in February this year about drafting the "complex collaboration project of Danube countries," the prime minister said its main purpose was to put to profit the now underused huge potential of the most important European river, especially after completion of the Danube-Main-Rhine Canal. The idea of "a north-south waterway is shaping up that will enable a

busy commercial traffic between north and south seas," he said, and added ecologic and cultural arguments.

In the Romanian Government's opinion, the Bucharest gathering will occasion an exchange of ideas and information on the main objectives and areas of inter-Danubian cooperation, Premier Petre Roman said, and called on the governments of all riparian countries to join in seeking possibilities to create a general legislative and institutional framework for Danubian collaboration, both at a governmental and at a private level.

The Romanian premier further said he would welcome any initiative and suggestion able to support and encourage an influx of capital to Danubian countries, even from the private sector. Pointing out the best solutions could be found and fostered by the beneficiaries of such projects, the Romanian premier opined that action could be taken at a governmental level to attract capital and make use of financial resources, including those agreed upon with international financial organizations, granted to east-European countries to restructure their economies.

Premier Roman said that, in the Romanian Government's view, Danube collaboration should be open to other states, organizations and institutions as well that are interested to join. In that context, he welcomed the presence of the director of the Danube Commission Secretariat, noted the worthy initiative of administrative-territorial units to join their efforts within the "Danubian Regions' Working Community" and said that other subregional groups, especially the Balkan forum, the Pentagonal, the zone of "economic cooperation of the Black Sea" opened constructive ways for cooperation.

The Danube collaboration could, the premier concluded, contribute concretely to speeding up CSCE positive processes and become a catalyst of pan-European economic and human cooperation.

Prime Minister Addresses World Bank Seminar

AU2506113291 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0941 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES 25/6/1991—As we have already announced, a seminar began on Monday, June 24, in Bucharest, organized by the World Bank Mission, the Economy and Finance Ministry and the Council for Reform of Public Relation and Information.

Prime Minister Petre Roman, speaking at the official opening of the seminar, said:

"From the very beginning we have understood and appreciated the important part to be played by international financial institutions and, above all, by the World Bank, in the process of reform in Romania. The World Bank was involved in Romania's economic process also before the revolution. We hope that the presence of its representatives here today is a confirmation of its willingness to contribute to the recovery and the free development of economic activities in Romania, to making our country's economy efficient and well integrated within the world economic community.

"I reiterate the fact that we are fully open to your suggestions, for we hope to combine their concrete effects with our own ideas and, especially, with our commitment to implement the reform." The Romanian premier said, adding: "We must prove our reform is efficient, we must demonstrate the projects we mean to give priority to should be supported by an institution such as the World Bank."

In his turn, Mr. Thomas Hoopengardner, director of IBRD European office, head of the World Bank delegation, reasserted IBRD's pledge to support Romania's programme for a passage to a market economy, and pointed out the present mission was a concrete expression of that support. He said the World Bank Mission would come up with positive ideas about various aspects of that programme and would make suggestions for improvement. He underlined the World Bank offered a considerable assistance to the efforts for implementation of the economic reform in Romania.

President Iliescu Interviewed by Soviet Weekly

AU2106172791 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1613 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 21/6/1991—In the interview granted for the Soviet home and foreign affairs weekly "NOVOYE VREMYA" President Ion Iliescu of Romania pays special attention to the Romanian-Soviet relations which, in his opinion, although with long-standing traditions, have not always been sincere and must not depend on circumstantial situations. President Iliescu expressed his belief that "the talks on Moldova, on Bessarabia more precisely, and more recently on Bukovina are deeply rooted in history. It is possible that history find a solution to the problems of these old Romanian territories. Romania's links with the Republic of Moldova are predetermined not only by history, culture, language, but also by blood, kinship. That is why we have spoken up for close relations on both a cultural and economic plane. As for the frontiers, Romania signed the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter and intends to abide by them.

The stirring of passions around Moldova does not serve either of sides. In politics actions are determined by reason and realism not by feelings. Although feelings should not be ignored either, Mr. Iliescu said.

President Ion Iliescu also refers to the treaty signed in Moscow in April which sets the relations between Romania and the Soviet Union on new bases "in consideration of the changes occurred both in our two countries and throughout the European continent."

Croatian Assembly Proclaims Independence

AU2506181791 Paris AFP in English 1807 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, Yugoslavia, June 25 (AFP)—The Croatian parliament solemnly proclaimed the independence of Croatia shortly before 1800 GMT in a session broadcast live on local television.

"The Croatian state is born", the speaker of the Croatian parliament proclaimed, while church bells rang out throughout the republic's capital.

Declaration on Croatian Autonomy Cited

LD2506111291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0952 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—The text of the Declaration on the Establishment of the Sovereign and Autonomous Republic of Croatia as a blueprint for dissociation from the present-day SFRY has been distributed to the Croatian Assembly deputies.

The declaration proceeds from "the 13-century-old state and legal tradition on the territory between the Adriatic Sea and the rivers of Drava and Mura and the right to individuality and independence in an autonomous and sovereign state of Croatia".

"In the period of the imposed centralist and totalitarian system of the SFRY, the Republic of Croatia could neither progress nor safeguard its political, economic, cultural, and other interests. As a result the aspiration continued to gain ground toward dissociation from the Yugoslav state community", the declaration states.

The declaration goes on to emphasize that with this move "the Republic of Croatia is embarking on the process of dissociation from other republics and the SFRY with the desire of seeing this process completed as soon as possible in a democratic and peaceful way, with respect for the interests of all the republics and autonomous provinces that comprised Yugoslavia."

"During the process of dissociation the Republic of Croatia will recognize only those federal institutions in which decisions are made on the basis of parity and agreement", the declaration states. According to the declaration, federal bodies will operate on the territory of the republic providing they have the approval of the Croatian government.

The decision has also been indicated on withdrawing Croatia's representatives from the SFRY Assembly's Federal Chamber, while the Chamber of the Republics and Provinces "should continue to perform the role of the legislative venue for considering the problem of dissociation".

In conclusion the declaration calls on other republics from the present-day SFRY to set up an alliance of sovereign states. The terms for this are "the recognition of state sovereignty and territorial integrity in relation to each other, mutual respect, the recognition of political pluralism and democracy, the pluralism of ownership forms and market economy, an effective respect for human rights, the rights of national minorities, and other civilized values as recognized by the free world, as well as readiness to enter into reciprocal agreements and contracts on all controversial issues which now exist between individual republics; that is, sovereign states".

Croatian Declaration Defines 'State Borders'

LD2506123391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1003 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—The draft of the constitutional decision on the sovereignty and autonomy of the Republic of Croatia, which was distributed to deputies in the Croatian Assembly, also considers the issue of borders.

"The state borders of the Republic of Croatia are the internationally recognized state borders of the current SFRY, which are on the territory of the Republic of Croatia, as well as the borders between the Republic of Croatia and the Republics of Bosnia- Hercegovina, Serbia and Montenegro within the current SFRY," point four of the constitutional decision states.

Croatian President's Independence Speech

LD2506213491 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1712 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Speech by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman at the Croatian Assembly session in Zagreb—live]

[Text] Mr. President, honorable Presidency members, ladies and gentlemen, honorable deputies of the Croatian Assembly:

Six months ago, on 22 December 1990, we adopted a Croatian Constitution. In the transitional and concluding regulations of Article 140 of the Constitution, we have stated: The Republic of Croatia remains in the SFRY until a new agreement of the Yugoslav republics is reached or until the Croatian Assembly decides othewise.

When we were adopting the Constitution, I said in my speech, among other things, that the Constitution charges us with developing a modern and sovereign Croatian Republic in all areas, with all the powers and characteristics of a sovereign and free democratic state. I also added that we will carry out the transition from the current state of affairs in the SFRY, in which republics have insufficiently defined semi-confederal status, into a new state of affairs, in line with our Croatian Constitution—and this means either a confederal alliance of sovereign states or full independence—through sensible policies and by respecting circumstances and the balance of power in the SFRY, in Europe, and in the world.

I also stressed that we will be guided always and solely by the permanent interest and final goals of the Croatian

nation and all citizens who regard Croatia as their homeland. These interests and objectives are, of course, that the Croatian Republic gains full independence and internationally recognized state sovereignty as soon as possible.

We are obligated to this by the will of the Croatian people, whose expressed this in a plebiscite and embodied it in a sacred constitution which we adopted and which all of us prepared in our struggle for a democratic order. We then presented, adopted, and proclaimed it; and in doing this we made a formal (?oath) in front of our nation that we will put it into practice.

Half a year has passed since that historic day. Developments have led us to implement the regulation mentioned from Article 140 of the Constitution. We have not succeeded in reaching an agreement on an alliance of sovereign republics of the former SFRY. Hence, the conditions have been laid down for us to make a decision on the proclamation of the Republic of Croatia's full sovereignty and independence.

Before and after adopting our Constitution we invested efforts in finding a way out of the Yugoslav state and political crisis through the transformation of the hitherto state community into an alliance of sovereign republics as sovereign states. To this end, we kept putting forward proposals at numerous SFRY Presidency sessions and meetings of the republican presidents. Together with the Slovene leadership, we put forward in writing the Croatia-Slovenia confederal proposal on the creation of an alliance of sovereign states. All our efforts were fruitless.

On 21 February of this year, this assembly adopted a resolution to embark on the process of dissociation from Yugoslavia and a possible association into an alliance of sovereign republics. With this resolution, we, as the Republic of Croatia, accepted the Slovene Assembly's resolution to embark on the process of consensual dissociation from the SFRY into several sovereign and independent states. In that resolution we said that new states, created out of this dissociation from the SFRY are sovereign in the full sense of the word within the entire territory of the existing republican borders. Then we said that the Croatian Assembly would propose that the dissociation process be carried out gradually, in a democratic way, and in the interests of all partners.

Furthermore, in that resolution we presented our—Croatian—views that the Republic of Croatia is prepared to integrate with other republics, but only with those republics and states of the present SFRY which recognize each other's fundamental rights to survival, independence, sovereignty, equality, and international identity and respect and which pledge not to interfere in the internal affairs of others, apart from cases envisaged by the international law. We also presented all the other conditions under which we would be prepared to forge an alliance of sovereign republics with other republics.

In 12 points we stated that for such an alliance to be forged, states must recognize and pledge each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity. All such states must accept the general principles of human and civil rights, legislative democracy, the free market, pluralism of ownership, and other widely accepted principles in today's Europe and the modern world. These states are striving to create a European and world order on the basis of true democratic foundations.

Since there was no reply to either the Slovene or our resolutions containing proposals on the creation of an alliance, which we sent to all the republics and the Federal Assembly; and since all our efforts in the aforementioned talks with other republics were hitherto met with no response, with no positive reply, we have decided to implement the outcome of the referendum. (more)

We opted for a referendum not because we did not know the Croatian nation's will and its aspirations to full sovereignty, but because of the fact that at one of the meetings of the republican presidents it was decided and agreed that a referendum or plebiscite should be held in all the republics in order to find out what the citizens favor—whether they favor independent republics or whether they are in favor of a federal state. That is, whether they are in favor of an alliance of sovereign states, or whether they are in favor of a united federal Yugoslavia. Our question addressed to the citizens in the referendum was: "Are you in favor of a sovereign and independent republic?" What kind of republic? A republic which guarantees cultural autonomy and all civil rights to Serbs and all other nationalities in Croatia, or a republic which, like independent and sovereign Croatia, can form an alliance of sovereign states with the other republics as set out by the proposal of Croatia and Slovenia?

We also asked our citizens, in accordance with our agreement, whether they favored Croatia staying in federal Yugoslavia as a united federal state, according to the proposition of the republics of Serbia and Montenegro. The results of this referendum endorsed the policy of the Croatian state leadership. They leave no doubt as to what the Croatian nation wants and demands. They were once again the plebiscite display of the Croatian nation's will for independence and full sovereignty. Even despite the fact that outlawry prevented some people from casting their vote, the referendum's turnout was about 84 percent of the electorate, according to electoral registers in the entire republic; 93.24 percent of those who turned out to vote were in favor of a sovereign and independent Croatia. This was yet another display of the political maturity, conscience, and resolve of the Croatian people and all Croatia's citizens in their desire to have their own republic as an independent and sovereign one in every respect.

The results of the referendum, held on 19 May 1991, compelled the leadership of Croatia and this Assembly to do everything necessary in order to achieve a resolute

and consistent implementation, stemming from the most democratic plebiscite decisionmaking. The will of the nation, expressed in the referendum, confirmed, as I said in the explanation of the referendum decision, to the entire domestic and foreign public the constitutionally endorsed regulation, which says that the sovereignty of the Republic of Croatia is inalienable, indivisible, and non-transferrable.

In line with this, the referendum decision itself makes us duty bound to examine whether the time has come to implement in practice Constitution Article 140, according to which the Assembly of the Republic of Croatia must pass the decisions needed in order to protect the Republic of Croatia.

This was said at the Assembly's formal session to mark the first anniversary of Croatia's Statehood Day on 30 May. On that occasion we also noted that ever since the establishment of a democratic constitutional-legal system in the Republic of Croatia, we have constantly been confronted by the facts, by their conduct, both the organs of the federation and of the Republic of Serbia have seriously, deliberately, and consistently been undermining the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Croatia, or have been assisting activities directed against its interests.

The very politically unscrupulous act of stopping Croatia's representative, Stjepan Mesic, from becoming president of the SFRY Presidency, according to the SFRY Constitution and established rotation, is one of the most flagrant but not infrequent attempts to keep Croatia in an unequal position in the Yugoslav Federation. This act, received with amazement by both the Croat and world democratic public - and also by concern among the most responsible factors in international affair - serves to remind that the reality of the postwar Yugoslavia is neither conducive to the expression nor the implementation of equality, and the equal distribution of duties and rights between all nations and republics.

Its entire state and social system has deviated so much from the constitutional commitments of the Anti-Fascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia and the Regional Council of the National Liberation of Croatia, and those adopted at a later stage, as to have become the mainstay of an anti-Croatian policy which has been instrumenal in encouraging pogroms against Croats, in stifling Croatian identity, and in eradicating Croatian national self-awareness, to such an extent that ordinary Croatian people are persecuted for promoting Croatian symbols and for expressing their love for their homeland. This policy has kept Croatia in a subordinate position from any point of view, even when it came to deciding who was suitable to represent it in the federal bodies. Precisely because we succeeded in putting an end to such a policy, Stjepan Mesic was prevented from being proclaimed president of the SFRY Presidency.

All this, and especially the attempts to block Croatia's equality in the top federal body itself—the SFRY Presidency—the unambiguous decision of the referendum, and a failure to reach an agreement, through talks, on transforming the current SFRY into an alliance of sovereign states obliged us to pass decisions providing for full sovereignty and independence [samostalnost].

Our specific experience gives us the right, or rather obliges us, to carry this out. I assure you that we shall convince our friends in the world that our move is justified. We can no longer justify our existence in a common state which is characterized by a permanent and hidden aggression against, and a pathological hatred of anything Croat; a state community in which we are constantly threatened by the use of force, both the common one and the illegal one of outlaws and terrorism. We cannot remain in a community which tolerates violent attempts at seizing the territory which belongs to Croatia, both geophysically, historically, and from any other point of view; a community whose policy cannot guarantee that the fruits of our peoples' labor on land and at sea are, primarily, to the advantage of their families and their own homeland.

We can no longer tolerate the situation in which the Yugoslav community protects those who cannot accept the freedom, democracy, and sovereignty of the Republic of Croatia.

In proclaiming the independence of Croatia, we are doing the same as all nations of the world on the road to achieving their independence, and out of the same natural and sublime reasons. Thus, for example, the creators of the U.S. Declaration of Independence of 1776 wrote: When a whole series of abuses and violence, which always has the same aim, exposes the intention of subjecting the nation and the people to complete injustice, it is their right, moreover their duty, to get rid of such rule and to ensure their future with their own government. Since we have the right to self-determination, to freedom from fear, and from any form of threat, we have the right, if the community does not protect us in our development—even from instances of barbarism and terror—to invoke the will of the people, and to realize our sovereignty and right in the form of state independence.

We were also prompted to make such decisions by the fact that the Republic of Slovenia, according to the decisions of its plebiscite of 26 December last year, would also proclaim by 26 June this year, its full independence and sovereignty. In this connection it should also be borne in mind that certain hegemonistic and Yugo-unitarist circles were prepared to allow the departure of Slovenia from the SFRY in order to then more easily carry out, in the remainder of Yugoslavia, their hegemonistic, centralist, and unitarist plans.

All these reasons prompted us to adopt the decision on the full sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Croatia. Since our efforts to find a way out of the state

and political crisis together with all other republics by creating an alliance of sovereign republics did not succeed, we took steps to prepare the realization of full state sovereignty, independence, and autonomy, together with Slovenia. In order that it should be as painless, as effective, and as swift as possible, we are aiming for this to be mutually coordinated and carried out simultaneously in both republics.

Apart from the failure to find a solution to the state-political crisis in the transformation of the present-day SFRY into an alliance of sovereign republics, we were also prompted to make the decision on the independence for economic reasons. The economic crisis has reached such a level that there is a danger of complete economic collapse. It is evident in the decline in production, which in the first quarter of this year was some 25 percent lower than in the same period last year—in which it was already 10 percent lower than in the previous year—although there was subsequently a certain improvement, so that the decline in the first five months of the year amounts to about 22 percent. Apart from the fall in industrial production by such a large percentage, we are also again facing growing inflation, a balance of payments deficit, lack of prospects of emerging from the economic crisis, and disrupted constitutional-legal order, in which such phenomena as an incursion into the monetary system is happening, which is both unprecedented and practically unheard of in the international world. At the same time, it is worth recalling the confiscation of property of Croatian enterprises in Serbia, and also the virtual trade and [word indistinct] war, the blockade of the market, and so on.

Indisputably, all this indicates that the time has come for the adoption of political decisions in order to find a way out of such a state-political and economic crisis in Yugoslavia. As for our decison to declare the independence of the Republic of Croatia, together and simultaneously with Slovenia and to start, that is, to carry on with the process of dissociation, one does not have to reflect on the proposal of the Republics of Serbia and Montenegro, which was met with the reply of all citizens of the Republic of Croatia in their referendum, as they rejected this Serb-Montenegrin proposition with 92 percent of the vote. This was as much as on the compromising proposition put forward by Presidents Alija Izetbegovic and Kiro Gligorov on behalf of Bosnia-Hercegovina and Macedonia, and on the stand FEC President Ante Markovic is propagating on behalf of himself and the federal government.

The compromising Gligorov-Izetbegovic proposal is however based on the sovereignty of the republic, but it is limited by the fact that it accepts the sovereignty of the republics within one single compact federal state. This in fact means that it amounts to the preservation of an inconsistent and self-contradictory confederal concept in the mold of the 1974 Constitution. As we know, that constitution was first knocked back by the unilateral decision of the Republic of Serbia to abolish the autonomy of Vojvodina and Kosov, and then by adopting constitutions is rejected by the well- known demand and propositions of Serbia and Montenegro for the creation of an ostensibly modern democratic federation. The essence of the Croat-Slovene confederal draft treaty with regard to the sovereignty of the republics as states was only partly included in this Bosnia-Hercegovina-Macedonian proposal, and this is why it was accepted by the representatives of Serbia and Montenegro.

In addition, they want, even at the initial stage of adoption, to cleanse it from its confederal elements—just as they claimed at an earlier point in the course of debating the state and political crisis—that it was precisely the confederal elements of the 1974 constitution which caused the state and political crisis in the SFRY. Since we find such a compromising proposition unacceptable, as does Slovenia, and since we are forced to conclude that it is impossible to reach an agreement on an alliance of sovereign states with all the republics, we are left with the decision to declare independence and to establish an alliance between Croatia and Slovenia. In light of the fact that it has not been accepted by other republics we must also examine among ourselves as to which elements should be included in this Croat-Slovene alliance.

In connection with the federal government, it is necessary to mention that lately the federal government, its minister for foreign affairs, and even its president, have taken steps which in principle acknowledge the idea of resolving the state and political crisis on the lines of an alliance of sovereign states. In practice, however, they are making moves—especially in informing the foreign public—moves which are creating a mood of opposition to the alliance proposed by our Republic of Croatia, and which the Republic of Slovenia has been proposing, and they are especially against the independence and full sovereignty of republics.

In this respect, a speech made by federal foreign secretary, Budimir Loncar at the Berlin CSCE conference on 19 and 20 June was indicative. By the way, it is very interesting that republican representatives did not attend that conference, which discussed Yugoslavia in particular, while republican representatives attended the previous CSCE Paris conference, which did not discuss Yugoslavia. The manner in which the federal secretary—about whom representatives of other republics constantly say that he is a representative of the Croatian Republic—presented his view on the state and political crisis in Yugoslavia to European and world factors at that conference has already been assessed by this Assembly. I am dwelling on it only to show from which positions opposition to the recognition of the independence of Croatia is being instigated.

According to Loncar, Yugoslavia today is, I quote, "between a realistic possibility of finding a peaceful and democratic way out of the crisis, and a danger of internal conflicts, with various consequences possibly being reflected outside Yugoslavia's narrow geopolitical

space." What would happen in the case of Yugoslavia's disintegration, the federal ministers asks himself, and then he goes on to reply: "The basic hypothesis is that states would be created which would not just be in permanent mutual conflicts; each of them would also be ethnically shaken, each would be incapacitated to become truly a democratic and European (state). All together, they would be a timebomb at the heart of Europe, if previously they do not set in motion a chain reaction on the continent, where 46 potentially dangerous ethnic conflicts are smoldering." Further on, he concludes that the country's integrity should be preserved because it is a presupposition of a democratic development, to the same extent to which democracy is the imperative of wholeness.

Federal government president, Ante Markovic, who in the eyes of other republics is a representative of Croatia and because of that they cannot accept yet another Croat to head the SFRY Presidency, accepts the idea of an alliance of sovereign states but more in the framework of the compromised proposal by Macedonia and Bosnia than as an alliance of sovereign states as outlined in the Croat-Slovene proposal.

It is the most responsible people in the federal government who see no solutions other than continuing the road of reform within the all-Yugoslav framework, regardless of the fact that the reasons for Yugoslavia's deep political crisis are found not only in the disintegration of the socialist system, but also primarily in the crisis of interethnic relations between the republics. They see the introduction of a free market and pluralistic democracy—which we supported, accepted, and in which Markovic and his government played a positive role—as the only lifesaving solution for social reforms. However, in the circumstances as they are in the Yugoslav state community these are neither essential nor most important. The problem lies in the need to resolve interethnic and interrepublic relations.

The view that the independence of the republics would cause internal conflicts and conflicts among them which would be a time bomb in the heart of Europe is unacceptable. It is also unacceptable that neither of the republics, Croatia nor Slovenia, have the capacity to be genuinely democratic and, from the point of Europe, independent and deserving of an entry into Europe. It is also unacceptable that there is no other solution but a civil war. In any case, since the beginning of the democratic transformations in Croatia and Yugoslavia, the threat of civil war has been used as an instrument of fear by dogmatic communist and hegemonistic unitarist forces which are against democratic transformations in society as a whole and against the sovereignty of the Republic of Croatia, in particular, and also by individuals without any political base in either Croatia or other republics.

For this reason it must be stressed that these views are not the view of the Republic of Croatia and, what is more, they are contrary to the interests of the Croatian nation and all citizens of the Republic of Croatia. We maintain that these views are damaging not just to Croatia but also to Yugoslavia entirely and even to Europe when offered to the world and to most responsible European and world factors as departure points and a framework for resolving the Yugoslav crisis and for forming an attitude to the independence of Croatia and Slovenia.

In this connection we must mention the international factors and interest in resolving the Yugoslav crisis.

We fully understand, of course, the concern of some states and the European community at large over the Yugoslav crisis, as well as the concern of the main world power, the United States. We can understand their desire to preserve Yugoslavia's territorial integrity. We appreciate their support toward the democratic transformation and even their suggestions that the Yugoslav crisis should, if possible, be solved within Yugoslavia's borders. In line with these suggestions, as well as in line with the fairly explicit demands of the most responsible factors of the European Community and the United States, we did table, together with the Slovenes, a draft confederal solution to the Yugoslav crisis in terms of transforming the then existing confederal state into an alliance of sovereign states, into an alliance of its republics as a community of sovereign states.

However, while taking into account everything that is set out in the explanation of the demand that a solution to the crisis should at all costs be found along Yugoslav lines—in order to maintain the peace or to prevent a disintegration of Yugoslavia from exerting negative influence, thus flaring up a chain reaction in other parts of Europe—we nonetheless point out that we must primarily take into account our own national interests, the interests of our own nation, and its republic. Second, we must note that this Yugoslavia as it is, since its very birth after World War I, and with all its experience during World War II, and onward up to the present day has been no factor of stability and peace on this soil or in this part of Europe.

On the contrary, only a solution to the state and political crisis in terms of creating either an alliance of sovereign republics, or dissociation in a democratic way between democratic states, in terms of Scandinavianizing this Balkans peninsula, could be a contribution to peace, a contribution to removing war-threatening hotbeds of crisis, and a contribution to the stability of international order in this part of Europe. Let us also say, in addition to all these, that we are all too aware of the fact that not only have some international factors closely followed everything that has been happening in Yugoslavia, but have also become actively involved in pressing for their solutions to the Yugoslav crisis, by even deploying such forms which border on various forms of influencing public opinion. These were not just the usual forms of international democratic communications and interaction—these were rather peaking to the level of open pressure.

In this context, the fact is gaining prominence that they are governed by their own interests, something that is entirely normal, but in so doing these international factors demonstrate their ignorance of the history of the present situation and the causes behind the current state an political crisis, just as much as their being evidently influenced mostly by the federal government—with some assisting political nonentities from Croatia—a federal government in which, as we are repeatedly and explicitly being reminded, the major roles and lines are ostensibly performed by representatives of the Republic of Croatia.

Honorable deputies, the constitutional decision we are adopting today in this supreme home declares the republic of "Croatia a sovereign and independent state. By this act, the Republic of Croatia is embarking on the process of dissociation from the other republics and the SFRY.

At the same time, with this step we will begin the procedure to ensure the international recognition of the Republic of Croatia. In view of the fact the friendly Republic of Slovenia is also proclaiming its independence today, I recommend that this esteemed house pass a decision to recognize independent Slovenia from the international law aspect since at its session today the Slovene Assembly will also recognize the independent and sovereign state of Croatia. [prolonged applause and according to announcer's interjection the deputies are on their feet]

Parallel with our dissociation process we will continue to propose to other republics the creation of an alliance of sovereign republics which will now have the status of sovereign states. It should be stressed today that we have reached an agreement in principle with the state leadership of Slovenia that Croatia and the Republic of Slovenia should establish a negotiated relationship between two independent and sovereign states. We will be open to set up this kind of alliance with all other republics which accept the principles in the above-mentioned resolution. By the proclamation of independence, the current borders of the Republic of Croatia become state borders in relations to other republics and neighboring states of the SFRY.

Esteemed deputies, allow me to refer to some of the public debates and disinformation.

The Croatian Republic leadership has frequently stressed that it is in favor of respecting all borders of the republics of the present SFRY, especially of Bosnia-Hercegovina. But the Croatian Republic leadership also warns those who may be thinking of redrawing the current Yugoslav borders in order to create a greater Serbia, according to a plan that all Serbs live in one state, or some other plan which would endanger the existing borders—in that case the issue of Croats who are living outside the Republic of Croatia, mainly in Bosnia-Hercegovina, and partly in Serbia and Montenegro, will be raised. [applause]

It is understandable that the Republic of Croatia must look after those members of the Croatian people, its state, and its political borders, if others start to redraw them. When resolving all these issues, we should respect the right of the peoples of all republics to decide their own fate, and in any settlement out of all elements that must be taken into account, national, historical, and geopolitical elements should primarily and especially be taken into account.

Esteemed house, from the moment of the proclamation of independence on the territory of the Croatian Republic, only laws adopted and to be adopted by the Croatian Assembly do and will apply, and until [applause], and until the process of dissociation is completed, only federal laws which are not outlawed [by Croatia]. In the view of internal and international circumstances, the proclaimed independence cannot be instant in all areas of domestic and international life. The process of dissociation will last for days in some areas, in others months, and in some maybe a year or two. For instance, the issue of the Army, the issue of international recognition, the issue of division of rights and duties belonging previously to the former federal community. This means that there is a need for the federal bodies to function so that dissociation can be carried out, and for talks to continue on ways of ending the Yugoslav state and political crisis. Many temptations and many efforts are waiting, dear friends, on this road to dissociation and final independence.

In order to speed up the process of dissociation in all areas, many tasks and serious business await both the Croatian Government and this sabor. In this process we must display both judiciousness, skill and resolve in order to defend our sovereign rights, but also complete understanding for the respect of others' rights. In this way alone will we ensure this dissociation is carried out in a peaceful, [word indistinct] and effective way.

By proclaiming the independence of Croatia we are sending out a message that in parallel with the dissociation steps, we on our side are displaying the best will and readiness to have talks on attaining an agreed accord, if possible establishing a union of sovereign states, but under one single condition—that the total sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Croatia is thereby assured in relation to all other parties to such a possible union, a union that could be built on the EC pattern.

I also wish to resolutely stress that we are decisive in our efforts to bring about a consistent democratic solution of all the issues emanating from the actual life of Serbs in Croatia, including those who have been artificially provoked by deception or stage-managed lawlessness [odmetnistvo]. In this connection we are appealing to those who have been pushed forcibly into lawlessness by Chetnik extremists to return to a normal life without fear. When establishing the constitutional and legal system only those who have committed terrorist crimes will be called to account. To this end, and in the context

of all the measures to reestablish the infringed constitutional and legal system, the government will have to put forward special legal measures to forego the prosecution of those lawbreakers who merely participated in lawbreaking actions and did not perpetrate any serious crimes. I believe that the proclamation of independence is a suitable time to show in this way that the democratic authorities in the Republic of Croatia want to secure complete safety and all national and civic rights, both to Serbs and all other nationalities who consider Croatia their homeland.

Esteemed house, with our decisions during this session, we are demonstrating today what all other free nations demonstrated throughout their independent history—that the path out of injustice and out of stifled sovereignty during our life together in federal Yugoslavia is only possible by resolutely and wisely tackling the implementation of full state independence. This has always been and remains an essential condition, confirmed by modern civilization, for the normal and unhampered development of everyone, and of course of the Croatian people, and of all citizens of the Republic of Croatia.

As a free and independent state Croatia is as of today taking over full constitutional powers. This will, I am convinced, enable a faster democratic and economic transformation of our society and life, especially in defending our territorial integrity in line with democratic tenets of our history and the free western world to which we belong, and all the principles written in our constitution.

It is with an obvious pleasure and pride that I am now informing all the republics and federal bodies of the SFRY, and announcing to the entire world, the sovereign will of the Croatian people and all the citizens of the Republic that as of today Croatia is an independent and sovereign state. [applause]

[Announcer says over applause: "We are again witnessing the ceremonial, if I may say so, reaction of the deputies to the Assembly of the Republic of Croatia, and as you can hear they are all applauding in unison to President Tudjman's proposition. The long rapturous applause conveys their united will and concord with President Tudjman"]

[Tudjman] We are calling on the governments and legislatures of all states to accept and recognize the Croatian people's act of free will, an act of freedom expressing the desire of yet another nation to become a full member of the international community of the free world. By adopting the constitutional decision on declaring the independence of the Republic of Croatia, we are taking another momentous and determined action to which we are dutybound by the will of the Croatian nation and the majority of citizens of our republic—that will which has already become, by virtue of the constitution, a granite foundation and, by virtue of the referendum, a collosal display of the maturity and conscience of our being on the path of the final materialization of the full freedom and indivisible sovereignty of the Republic of Croatia. This was the century-long unfulfilled dream of the Croatian people at large, the continual ideal of all our forebears and contemporaries, and the aspiration and longing of every one of our people in our homeland and across the foreign world.

Let the sovereignty and independent Republic of Croatia live forever. [applause, followed by Croatia's national anthem]

More on Slovene Declaration of Independence

LD2506202991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1814 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—As an autonomous and independent state the Republic of Slovenia proclaims that the SFRY Constitution is no longer valid on its territory and that it is taking steps to assume de facto authority on its territory. It is prepared to carry out this procedure gradually and in agreement with other republics in what till now has been the SFRY, so that equal rights of other republics in this matter are not violated. This has been stressed in the declaration in connection with independence, one of the three independence acts adopted by the Slovene Assembly during its joint session today.

The declaration expresses its readiness to continue at once the talks on possible forms of ties with the states which will emerge on the SFRY territory. On the basis of reciprocal recognition the Republic of Slovenia is ready to start negotiations immediately on the conclusion of an accord to set up a community of sovereign states on the territory of what has been to date Yugoslavia.

In keeping with the decision of the Croatian Assembly [SABOR], the Republic of Slovenia recongizes Croatia as a sovereign state and as a subject in international law.

The proclamation of the declaration signals the end of the mandate of the delegates from Slovenia in the Federal Chamber of the SFRY Assembly, and also of the delegation in the Chamber of the Republics and Provinces. The Slovene Assembly is to elect a new 12-member delegation to take part in the talks on the dissociation of what until now has been the SFRY, in the quest for resolving the current problems during the interim period and during the talks on the possible formation of a community of sovereign states.

The Slovene Assembly also empowers the present member of the SFRY Presidency from Slovenia to take part in the work of the Presidency as this republic's representative. All the issues which have not yet been fully resolved, for instance the status of the Yugoslav People's Army, the question of one's authority in the sphere of international relations, and the division of common property, will be regulated by a special agreement between the Republic of Slovenia and appropriate organs within the framework of present Yugoslavia.

The Republic of Slovenia, as a subject in international law, says the declaration, complies with all the principles of international law and within the sense of legal inheritance of the stipulations of all international agreements concluded by the SFRY with reference to the territory of the Republic of Slovenia.

The Republic of Slovenia will also strive for the international community to accept favorably the proclamation of the autonomous and independent republic, expecting the countries that respect democratic processes and the right of all nations to self-determination to recognize it de facto and from the viewpoint of international law. It also expects the international community will contribute to the formation of a community of sovereign states on the territory of what until now has been the SFRY, and in so doing to an agreed and peaceful implementation of the decision on an autonomous and independent state, the Republic of Slovenia.

Kucan Lists Principles for Slovene Cooperation

LD2506190891 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1743 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—When the interests and possibilities for a community of sovereign states on the territory of the present SFRY are established, the following principles must be complied with, in the view of the Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia. Milan Kucan set them out in his introductory address to the Slovene Assembly:

The new states formed with the dissociation of the SFRY are sovereign and have full authority on their territory within the framework of the existing borders of each present republic.

The newly formed states reciprocally recognize each other's status of sovereign states as subjects in international law.

These states guarantee their citizens equal rights and freedoms regardless of their nationality [nacionalna pripadnost] and other differences.

These states guarantee all rights and freedoms of human beings as individuals and the rights of peoples, national communities, and other collective rights in keeping with international law.

These states guarantee the right to ownership, entrepreneurial freedom, freedom of trade union association, and free flow of goods, people, and capital.

These states guarantee the collective security system, including reciprocal cooperation in the defense and protection area.

These states respect the unity of the European ecological area. The community member-states may conclude alliances with other European states and have the right to conclude bilateral and multilateral agreements.

Kucan stressed that Slovenia cannot go below the level of these principles, despite the usefulness and need to cooperate with the states of what to date have been Yugoslav nations.

Kucan States Independence Not Devoid of Risk

LD2506191191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1709 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—Solving the Yugoslav problem is not entirely devoid of any risk. However, the biggest risk would be to preserve present Yugoslavia by force. Life together rests on obsolete ideological foundations and engenders nationalistic intolerance and hegemonist ambitions by numerically bigger nations. Slovene President Milan Kucan said this during the Slovene Assembly joint session today.

At the Slovene Assembly session today deputies should express their views on the proposed documents on the proclamation of an autonomous and independent Slovenia.

After Kucan's speech the delegates will be addressed by Slovene Prime Minister Lojze Peterle, followed by the vote on independence. In conclusion, Slovene Assembly President France Bucar will address the delegates.

FEC Declares Secessions 'Null and Void'

LD2606011191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0016 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—Proceeding from its constitutional responsibility for the situation in the country, and from its duty to protect the sovereign rights and territorial integrity in particular of the SFRY, as well as from international law and Yugoslavia's obligations toward the international community, the Federal Executive Council [FEC] has decided and declared:

1. The decision of the Republic of Slovenia of 25 June this year amounts to political, legal, and real secession from Yugoslavia, and so do the decisions of the Assembly of the Republic of Croatia to embark on this process. These decisions constitute unilateral documents adopted without any agreement with the other constituent factors of Yugoslavia; therefore they are illegal and illegitimate, and all the consequences of these actions are rendered null and void.

2. Acting in line with the SFRY Constitution and the conclusions of the Federal Chamber of the SFRY Assembly of 25 June this year, the FEC has reached the necessary decisions which should ensure the normal functioning of the state of the SFRY, the protection of its existing state and internal borders, and the carrying out of its international duties.

3. The FEC maintains that it is necessary that democratic talks on resolving the constitutional crisis and Yugoslavia's future setup are resumed in agreement by

all. To facilitate such talks it is necessary for representatives of Serbia and Montenegro to lift their blockade of the election of Stipe Mesic from the Republic of Croatia as president of the SFRY Presidency.

4. The FEC calls on, and demands of, all citizens of Yugoslavia to maintain the peace, refrain from violence, and respect the Constitution and legislation of the SFRY, the FEC statement says.

Federal Chamber Assails 'Unilateral Secession'

LD2506222591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1959 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—The federal chamber of the SFRY Assembly this afternoon adopted, by a majority of votes, conclusions on a statement passed by the Slovene Assembly on 8 May.

The conclusions state that the Slovene Assembly's statement contains stands on the unilateral secession of the Slovene Republic from Yugoslavia which endanger the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, its state borders, and sovereignty in international relations.

The federal chamber hence recognizes neither internal nor international legitimacy of the Slovene Assembly's decision on unilateral secession from Yugoslavia. The Slovene Assembly will bear all responsibility for consequences which unilateral secession brings with it.

According to international law, unilateral secession of a part of the state, even if it becomes a reality, does not put an end to the existence of a state from which a part is seceding, and does not open a problem of legal sucession. At this moment, there are no facts which could justify a discussion on secession, because Yugoslavia exists and the issues of its successor is not known.

For this reason, the Federal Chamber has neither constitutional nor international-legal nor political grounds to negotiate with the Slovene Assembly about legal secession, and it refuses to negotiate about this.

The Federal Chamber on this occasion also expresses readiness to work in an accelerated, responsible, and democratic manner, with assemblies of all republics on the transformation of relations in Yugoslavia and on a negotiated regulation of these relations.

The Federal Chamber calls on the Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia to a dialogue and a negotiated regulation of relations in Yugoslavia, which presupposes a discussion and decision-making about any proposal of the Slovene Assembly regarding the fate and future of Yugoslavia.

The FEC [Federal Executive Council] and all Yugoslav institutions, including the security and Yugoslav People's Army organs, are duty-bound to undertake in a continuous manner measures and activities which will prevent the redrawing of Yugoslavia and its borders, and disruption in the SFRY's border system, the change of the Yugoslav customs borders bodies into republican bodies, and the appropriation of customs duties and the property of Yugoslavia; and they are duty-bound to undertake all legal measures to oppose unilateral acts, stands, and behavior through which one's will is imposed on others.

The Federal Chamber charges the FEC and the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs to inform foreign governments, especially of neighboring countries, and all international institutions that the SFRY Assembly does not recognize the legality of the Slovene Assembly's statement on dissociation from the SFRY nor any other similar document, because they are unilateral anticonstitutional documents which could have unforseen consequences at internal and international levels.

The Federal Chamber charges the National Bank of Yugoslavia to follow resolutely and responsibly the use of the Yugoslav currency as the means of payment in all republics and depending on the situation, to undertake urgent measures which would safeguard the economic interests of Yugoslavia from illegal use of the Yugoslav dinar.

Federal Chamber Adopts Conclusions on Slovenia

AU2506191391 Belgrade RTV Sat TV in Serbo-Croatian 1730 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] The newscast's reporter from the SFRY Assembly has reported that the conclusions of the Federal Chamber have been adopted following a discussion of the statement by the Slovene Assembly to dissociate itself from Yugoslavia as of tomorrow.

For this newscast we have singled out from the conclusions the stand according to which the Federal Executive Council and all institutions of Yugoslavia, including the security organs and the organs of the Yugoslav People's Army, are bound to continuously undertake measures and activities—which were prompted by unilateral acts—in order to prevent the reshaping of Yugoslavia, changes to its borders, the violation of the current status of Yugoslavia's borders, the transformation of customs organs of Yugoslavia into republican organs, and the appropriation of duties and the property of Yugoslavia.

All these organs are also obliged to undertake all legal means to oppose the unilateral decisions and stances and behavior that impose someone's will on somebody else—the conclusions of the Federal Chamber point out.

Federal Chamber Conclusions on Crisis Solution

AU2506153791 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Olivija Rusovac and Mirjana Trajkovic report]

[Text] The Federal Chamber of the SFRY Assembly today discusses Slovenia's statement on disassociation. At present it is not known what form the conclusions that were proposed by two working bodies of the Federal

Chamber yesterday will take. This afternoon the delegates may also discuss the platforms proposed by the Federal Executive Council and the presidents of Bosnia-Hercegovina and Macedonia, Alija Izetbegovic and Kiro Gligorov respectively, on how the (?crisis in Yugoslavia) should be resolved. Olivija Rusovac and Mirjana Trajkovic report from the (?Federal Chamber):

[Rusovac, Trajkovic] The Slovene Assembly's statement on dissociation has caused a real avalanche of discussions. In addition to those that favored a new round of negotiations and dialogues about the Federal Government's platform on the organization of future relations in Yugoslavia, there were also warnings about the consequences that the Slovene decision on dissociation could have, which many people interpret as an attempt to secede and a [word indistinct] intention.

For instance, Mijat Sukovic said among other things that if Slovenia does what it has announced then one cannot discount forced actions that are outside the normal framework of a dialogue. The Slovene public has been deceived at the plebiscite and the unilateral decision could seriously endanger lives. Sukovic proposed a conclusion according to which the Federal Chamber should endorse a decision by the Federal Executive Council that would be extorted by unilateral acts and that the government, the Army, and the security organs should not allow the redrawing of borders and the transformation of customs into republican customs until the final agreement on the structure of the country. According to Sukovic, this implies [words indistinct] of the Army.

(?Vucina) Jovanovic proposed that the Supreme Command dismiss the SFRY Presidency and introduce extraordinary measures in Slovenia. Is it possible that private Jansa is stronger than Brovet?—Jovanovic asked the delegates.

This statement prompted several replies. [first name indistinct] Bajrami wanted the Federal Executive Council to take a stand on such proposals especially because they are not in line with the spirit of its platform.

Answering a question put forward by Dragan Malovic, the federal public prosecutor said that the act of dissociation is considered the criminal act of endangering territorial integrity and that the law envisages a punishment of one to ten years imprisonment, or even the death sentence. At present, however, the federal public prosecutor was not able to say whether a criminal act had been committed.

Bozo Kovac warned that an attempt to halt the current processes would lead to war. Will the Army enter Slovenia? In this case Slovenia will put up resistance. Sending joint militia units to the border would also cause clashes. There will also be clashes if the Federal Executive Council tries to prevent [word indistinct] currents, Kovac said, adding (as did other Slovene delegates) that Slovenia is offering a discussion on a union of sovereign states.

At the request of (?Hisen) Ramadani to explain whether the government knows something in connection with the Army that the delegates did not know, Zivko Pregl, vice president of the Federal Executive Council, said:

[Begin Pregl recording] As regards (?the question) posed by (?Hisen) Ramadani and comrade Solanovic, I would first of all like to say that the Federal Executive Council is following events. This is done by its working bodies and departments, and their working bodies, and we do not have any official information that would require the Federal Executive Council to change its stand made in response to point 10 of the rules of procedure. There is no information nor reasons in the country or outside the country, near or far away from the borders. [end recording]

[Rusovac, Trajkovic] At the end of the morning's session the president of the Federal Chamber Bogdana Glumac-Levakov read the draft conclusions:

The Federal Chamber, the conclusions state, does not accept the statement of the Slovene Assembly as it represents an unconstitutional act that unilaterally changes the constitutionally determined system and relations in the Yugoslav community to the detriment of other peoples and republics, changes borders, and undermines the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Yugoslavia. The chamber charges the Federal Executive Council and the competent federal organs to undertake all the necessary measures as determined by the SFRY Constitution and federal laws in order to preserve the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the country and ensure a peaceful denouement of the constitutional and political crisis until an agreement has been reached on the future organization of the Yugoslav community. The chamber charges the Federal Executive Council, proceeding from the SFRY Constitution and federal laws, to immediately take measures and ensure that decisions are implemented, that is, the decisions of the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia and inform the Chamber about this without a delay.

Proceeding from the SFRY Constitution and international legal acts, the Chamber will, in case Slovenia and other republics carry out the unilateral act of secession, inform international organizations and states of this, as well as measures that the federal organs would take in connection with this. This is pointed out in the conclusions of the Federal Chamber that the delegates will vote on after the break in the session scheduled for 1630 [1430 GMT].

It is still uncertain as to whether the chamber will today discuss the second point on the agenda, the platform of the Federal Executive Council and the proposals made by Alija Izetbegovic and Kiro Gligorov on how the Yugoslav crisis should be resolved. It is possible that the discussion will start this afternoon and continue on Friday, as announced. It is certain that the Federal Chamber will not work tomorrow because of the commitment of many delegates.

Chamber To Ask FEC To Protect Sovereignty

LD2506142191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1341 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—After a five-hour debate on the Slovene Assembly's statement on dissociation, a session of the Federal Chamber of the SFRY Assembly was adjourned until 1630 for the delegates to prepare conclusions.

This task will be carried out by the Legislative-Legal Commission and the Committee for Sociopolitical Relations.

The stand of the Federal Government and that of the Committee for Sociopolitical Relations will serve as the basis for the conclusions. The draft conclusions stress, among other things, that the Federal Chamber does not endorse the Slovene Assembly's statement on dissociation and calls on the FEC [Federal Executive Council] to take measures for the protection of the SFRY's sovereignty and territorial integrity and the creation of conditions for a peaceful, legal, and democratic settlement of the Yugoslav crisis.

Compromise Proposals 'Solid Basis' for Talks

LD2606033391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0013 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 25 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav legislature assessed here tonight that the platform of the federal government and the compromise proposal by the Republics of Macedonia and Bosnia-Hercegovina on the settlement of the country's constitutional and political crisis constitute a solid basis for continuation of negotiations on Yugoslavia's future organisation.

The Federal Chamber, a kind of a House of Commons of the Yugoslav bi-cameral legislature bound the Constitutional Commission to prepare stands for a legisltive discussion next month on the basis of these two documents.

The compromise proposal which met approval of the leaders of Yugoslavia's six republics earlier this month, starts from the stand that the sovereignty of the republics within a sovereign Yugoslav community should be recognised.

Slovenia and Croatia, however, proclaimed their sovereignty and independence on Tuesday evening. They have announced their intention to join an alliance and proposed to the other republics to immediately open negotiations on forming an 'alliance of sovereign states.'

The federal government platform, however, excludes unilateral decisions on Yugoslavia's future and proposes that no re-tailoring of the borders be allowed until a new agreement on the country's organisation has been reaped, that the continuation of reforms be made possible and that all illegal armed groups in the country be disarmed.

The majority of deputies in the federal assembly upheld the stands of the federal government and demanded that it use all available means to protect the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia.

Federal State To 'Take Over' Slovene Borders

LD2606022291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0129 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—At its session tonight, chaired by Ante Markovic, the Federal Executive Council [FEC] made a decision on how to directly ensure the implementation of federal legislation regulating border crossings on the territory of the Republic of Slovenia, the FEC Secretariat for Information announces. The decision is as follows.

1. In order to ensure the implementation of federal legislation regulating border crossings and movements in border zones in the territory of the Republic of Slovenia as well as to ensure the carrying out of the SFRY's international duties and an undisrupted flow of international traffic and free movement of people across the state border, the Federal Secretariat for Internal Affairs will directly take over, that is, ensure the carrying out of the control services over crossings of the state border.

2. In its direct protection of the implementation of federal legislation regulating border crossings, the Federal Secretariat for Internal Affairs will directly cooperate with the Federal Secretariat for National Defense to also engage Yugoslav Peoples' Army [YPA] border units in protecting state borders at border crossings and in built-up areas in the border zone.

The methods of carrying out this cooperation, as stated in paragraph one of this item, will be endorsed by an agreement between the federal secretary for internal affairs and the federal secretary for national defense.

3. If a federal administrative organ or a federal organization encounters physical or other resistance, or if such resistance is likely to the carrying out of its control of passengers and goods, workers of the Federal Secretariat for Internal Affairs are duty bound to help that administrative organ, or federal organization, at its request.

4. More detailed conditions and methods for carrying out these decisions will be specified by the federal secretary for internal affairs.

5. The Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs will inform the competent organs of the neighboring states about the temporary regulations for crossing the state border in the territory of the Republic of Slovenia in line with these decisions.

In the second part of its session the FEC issued an order that the erection of so-called border crossings be banned within the SFRY's territory, which reads as follows:

1. The installation of so-called border crossings within the SFRY's territory is forbidden.

The border crossings that have already been set up must be removed on the day this order comes in effect.

2. The Federal Secretariat for Internal Affairs and the Federal Secretariat for National Defense will carry out this order.

Chamber Claims 'Duty' To Prevent 'Changes'

LD2506175291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1728 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—The Federal Executive Council and all other Yugoslav institutions including the security organs and the Yugoslav People's Army, have the duty to take all measures necessary to prevent the tailoring of Yugoslavia and any changes to its borders. This is being stressed in conclusions adopted by the Yugoslav Assembly Federal Chamber this afternoon following a debate on the Slovene Assembly's statement on disassociation. In its conclusions the Federal Chamber invites the Slovene Assembly to a dialogue and a negotiated arrangement of relations in Yugoslavia describing the resolution on disassociation as a unilateral act.

Kostic on Croatian Sovereignty Declaration

LD2606032691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2242 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Novi Sad, June 25 (TANJUG)—Croatia has made a decision on independence and sovereignty despite warnings about the unacceptibility of its statehood within the existing borders, member of the Yugoslav Presidency Jugoslav Kostic told TANJUG on Tuesday evening.

Kostic is representative of the northern province of Vojvodina on the eight-member federal Presidency, which has been blocked since May 15 when Stjepan Mesic, representative of the Republic of Croatia, was not elected its president under a regular, annual rotation procedure. The Republic of Serbia, the provinces of Vojvodina and Kosovo, and the Republic of Montenegro did not vote in Mesic's favour.

We will do everything in the Presidency to settle the crisis, if possible, in a democratic and peaceful way, through talks with other peoples in the country and in the interest of all, said Kostic. He, however, pointed out that 'we can by no means agree with the independent Croatian state to remain within the present borders."

Republics Warned of Nation's Economic Isolation

LD2506210191 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1814 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 25 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandar Mitrovic stated today that the decisions taken by Slovenia and Croatia on their dissociation from Yugoslavia meant a process, so that still after June 26, the same currency, the same market and the same financial courses with the world would remain to be valid for all.

In answering the questions asked by MPs of the three committees of the Federal Assembly's Chamber of the Republics and Provinces, Mitrovic cautioned against the further aggravation of the country's situation in case the two republics' decisions meant termination of all these courses.

"Our creditors abroad and all international financial institutions have told us that in that case we would be blocked economically and isolated financially," said Mitrovic and added that, as far as it is known, things were not developing in that direction.

UK Calls For 'Peaceful Dialogue' on Crisis

LD2506223191 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2032 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] London, June 25 (TANJUG)—The British Government on Tuesday [25 June] appealed on all factors in Yugoslavia to continue peaceful dialogue which would lead to the settlement of the present crisis.

Commenting [on] today's decisions of the Republics of Croatia and Slovenia on dissociation from Yugoslavia, the British Foreign Office spokesman set out his government's stand that none of the sides in the Yugoslav crisis should do anything which could threaten peace and talks on a peaceful way out of the crisis.

British television stations this evening gave extensive coverage to the decisions adopted in Zagreb and Ljubljana.

The basic comment was that Croatia and Slovenia did not accept the international community's appeal to abandon their decisions on "dissociation," which is in London openly being called secession.

Genscher, De Michelis Stress State Integrity

LD2606015691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2146 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 25 (TANJUG)—The foreign ministers of Germany and Italy, Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Gianni de Michelis, announced on Tuesday they recognized only Yugoslavia as subject of international law and stated dissatisfaction with one-sided acts of the republics of Slovenia and Croatia on disassociation from the Yugoslav Federation.

As announced in Belgrade, Genscher and de Michelis gave during a meeting in Rome talked over the phone with Yugoslav foreign secretary Budimir Loncar on all aspects of the current developments in Yugoslavia. [sentence as received]

Two northwestern republics—Slovenia and Croatia—proclaimed dissociation from Yugoslavia on Tuesday night.

Genscher and de Michelis repeated to Loncar the firm stand of support to the democratic changes and processes in Yugoslavia, to peaceful development and to the country's integrity.

Stating the conviction that progress would be made in seeking a joint solution for a way out of the present situation in which the country has found itself, Genscher and de Michelis told Loncar that this would enable the Council of the European Community at the meeting on June 28 in Luxembourg to adopt a decision in connection with the Yugoslav crisis, as set out in the announcement on the telephone talk between Rome and Belgrade.

France's Dumas Said To Warn Against 'Explosion'

LD2506174291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1554 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Paris, June 25 (TANJUG)—"France does not approve the developments which are leading to an explosion in Yugoslavia, but will, in the end, respect the will of its people," said French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas in parliament today, answering a question on the upcoming proclamation of independence in Slovenia and Croatia. Dumas added that he "hoped there would not be any conflict in Yugoslavia."

According to Dumas, disassociations can take place in "brutal conditions with the awakening of old antagonisms." He added that it would be sad if the "rediscovered independence were to turn into conflict." "All peoples have the right to self-determination, but we are all also subject to international order," added Dumas.

Situation Tense on Italian Border

LD2606124891 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1149 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Kopar, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—During this morning, at most of the border crossings between Yugoslavia and Italy there were distinct disagreements and arguments between members of the Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] and the Slovene police on questions of authority over the state border.

Contrary to this morning's claim by Bozo Truden of the information office of the Republican Secretariat for Internal Affairs that there were no unusual incidents on the border, the Kopar internal affairs administration is stressing that the situation is increasingly tense and that there is a danger of it developing into open conflict. All officials of the border organs are on duty.

The Kopar Secretariat for Internal Affairs has announced that this morning, at the Lipica and Skofija border crossings, members of the JNA attempted to prevent the replacement of insignia of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with insignia of the Republic of Slovenia. After a short and heated argument with the Slovene police, Republic of Slovenia insignia were nevertheless put up at these crossings.

Army Arriving at Kranjska Gora Border Crossing

LD2606133291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1214 GMT 26 Jun 91

Nova Gorica, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—Increasing numbers of Slovene police and territorial defense members are guarding the crossings between Yugoslavia and Italy in the regions of Nova Gorica. At some crossing points insignia of the Republic of Slovenia have already been erected and SFRY insignia removed. This was done despite the warning of the Yugoslav People's Army [JNA] that they will defend the legitimate and internationally recognized state border markings.

The situation is also worsening at the Ratece border crossing in Kranjska Gora. According to a Radio Ljubljana correspondent, increasing numbers of members of the JNA are arriving in the vicinity of this crossing.

Tudjman: Bulgaria Recognizes Independence

LD2506205291 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 2000 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Bulgaria has already recognized independent and sovereign Croatia, Croatian President Franjo Tudjman said this evening at a brief news conference.

He assessed that Croatia will not gain international recognition easily, but added that Croatia and Slovenia, despite all the difficulties, will achieve this more quickly than some other states.

Asked by journalists about rumors that the Federal Executive Council [FEC] has approved military intervention, Tudjman said that the FEC does not have the authority to use military force and that he does not believe something like that will happen.

In connection with warnings given by the Party of Democratic Change [Stranks demokratskih promjena] about possible incidents in the so-called central parts of Croatia following the proclamation of its independence, President Tudjman said that he is not excluding a possibility that incidents will occur, but that he is convinced that the unity of Croatia, accepted by many Serbs too, will prevent Chetnik extremists in their intentions.

Tudjman underlined that Croatia remains open for talks on an alliance of sovereign states, and that he made it clear that he would continue contacts with Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic.

Answering several questions about the dissociation process, the Croatian president said that some aspects will take days, some weeks, and some might last a year, but he refused to say which aspects he referred to.

Bulgaria Denies Recognition

LD2506215491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 2128 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Sofia, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—A spokesman of the Bulgarian Foreign Ministry denied tonight Franjo Tudjman's claim to the effect that Bulgaria has recognized Croatian independence. A ministry spokesman, cited by the BTA, said tonight that world news agencies had based their information on a statement made by Croatian President Tudjman and not on sources in Sofia.

Conflicting Statements Reported on Croatia

LD2506212291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1755 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, June 25 (TANJUG)—President of the Parliamentary Social-Political Council of the Yugoslav Republic of Croatia Ivan Vekic, told the republican parliaent today that the "situation in Croatia was peaceful and under control."

The statement came after the president of the opposition Party for Democratic Changes (SDP) and member of parliament Ivica Racan warned that some SDP members of parliament had left the session and gone to their constituencies in order to help in calming down the situation, and that there were indications of an "escalation of conflicts in the crisis areas in Croatia."

Shots were fired last night at 16 houses belonging to Serbs in Stari and in Novi Jankovci, some 10 km from Vinkovci in Slavonia, a border area between the republics of Croatia and Serbia.

The local people have asked for help from the Yugoslav People's Army, and if they do not get it, they threaten to move out massively.

Police chief Josip Raihl Kir in Osijek, the largest town in Slavonia, said today that a series of recent explosions in Osijek were aimed at creating an atmosphere of anxiety and fear.

Kir warned that there had been misinformation about an alleged [words indistinct] 300 armed Serbian extremists in the region, that rumors abounded in predominantly Serbian populated villages, saying that, after declaring independence, Croatian militia would attack the villages in revenge.

Kir underscored that such claims were groundless, but that there had been cases where women and children had been evacuated to the neighbouring province of Vojvodina (in the Republic of Serbia), which said Kir, had been unnecessary.

Zagreb Weekly on 'Inviolable Rulers' of Croatia

LD2606022691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1727 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, June 25 (TANJUG)—in its latest issue the Zagreb weekly DANAS writes that the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) and its 'most influential nucleus have become not only the ruling party, but also the inviolable rulers of Croatia.'

Former Communists and present members of the Party for Democratic Changes (SDP) were mainly lone voices while they were pointing out that people were being dismissed on the basis of their belonging to different parties and nationalities, writes DANAS. The weekly adds that other opposition parties had mostly remained silent except when declaring themselves against revanchism in principle, and that some had even urged a radical purge of all cadres holding official posts in Croatia.

Only after a line had been drawn under cadre changes made and carried through by the HDZ, did the remaining opposition parties react, claiming that undemocratic one-party changes were taking place in state organs, the economy, education, health and other activities, writes DANAS.

Croatia Decision Termed Invalid in Serbian Regions

LD2506212191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 2043 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Knin, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—"The Croatian Assembly decision on the constitution of a sovereign Republic of Croatia, which the Croatian people voted for in a referendum, is the right of the Croatian people, but it is a unilateral act as far as other nations and the SFRY state are concerned," Milan Babic, president of the Serbian Autonomous Region [SAR] of Krajina Executive council, said to TANJUG, commenting on the Croatian Assembly's decision this evening.

"The decisions can be applied only to Croatian ethnic territories, and certainly not to the Serbian territories—Pakrac Krajina, East Slavonia, West Srem and Baranja—and especially not to the territory of the SAR of Krajina, which on the basis of the expressed will of the Serbian people of Krajina was not a part of the former federal unit of Croatia [as received], voted to remain in one state with Serbia and Montenegro.

"Any attempt of this Republic of Croatia to seize the territory of the SAR of Krajina or any other part of the Serbian ethnic territory, will be an act of aggression that could cause fatal consequences for the aggressor and deprive the Croatian people of a historical opportunity to create their own independent nation state," Milan Babic said.

Serb Areas in Croatia To Stay in Common State

AU2506204091 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 2000 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Budimir Markovic report]

[Excerpt] Slavonia, Baranja, and Western Srem will remain in Yugoslavia together with the Serbian and other peoples who want to live in a common state. This was decided at the founding session of the great peoples assembly in Borovo Selo this evening. The assembly proposed that the decision on founding an autonomous region for Slavonia, Baranja, and Western Srem take effect with Croatia's dissociation. Budimir Markovic reports:

[Markovic] The unanimously adopted decision at the founding session of the great peoples assembly, which was attended by delegates from almost all communes of Slavonia, Baranja, and Western Srem, states that the Federal Constitution and federal laws and laws that are not in contradiction with the highest legal act of the country will continue to apply in this territory.

At the same time the decision warns that after the dissociation or secession of Croatia from Yugoslavia the Serbian people and sections of other peoples and minorities will remain in the common state in which the laws and regulations of the Republic of Croatia will not apply. [passage omitted]

Zagreb Radio Announces Croatian Charter

LD2506163991 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1324 GMT 25 Jun 91

["Charter on the rights of Serbs and other Nationalities in the Republic of Croatia" read by announcer]

[Text] Proceeding from the principle that the aim of every democratic and sovereign country is to protect and promote the dignity and equality of every human being and, therefore, to also promote the freedom and equality of all nationalities; proceeding from the authentic origins of the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia and the provisions concerning the cultural autonomy and the system of local self-government; and proceeding from the 1948 UN General Declaration on Human Rights, the declaration adopted in Copenhagen in 1990, and last year's Paris convention; and also proceeding from the modern practice of resolving nationality problems in democratic countries, the Assembly of the Republic of Croatia adopts this Charter on the Rights of Serbs and Other Nationalities in the Republic of Croatia.

Section one: An equitable (?solution of) the right of the Serbs and of other nationalities in the Republic of Croatia is one of the important factors of democracy, stability and economic progress and also of cooperation with other democratic countries.

Section Two: Protection and full implementation of the rights of all nationalities in the Republic of Croatia and also the protection of the rights of individuals is part and parcel of international protection of human and civic rights and protection of nationalities, and as such belongs to the areas of international cooperation.

Section Three: The rights of nationalities and international cooperation do not allow any activity which runs counter to the principles of international law, especially the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Croatia.

Section Four: All nationalities in Croatia are entitled to be protected against any activity which could threaten their existence; they are entitled to respect, self-preservation, and cultural autonomy.

Section Five: Serbs in Croatia and all nationalities have the right to participate on a proportional basis within the framework of local self-government [samouprava] and in appropriate bodies of state authority and to have their economic and social development safeguarded so that they can keep their identity and be protected against any assimilation attempt.

Section Six: The organization which in keeping with the objectives outlined in its statute is responsible for the protection and development of [words indistinct] nationality and is representative of this nationality is entitled to represent it as a whole and also its individual members both within the state and on the international level.

Full Mobilization Reported in Dvor na Uni

AU2606133791 Belgrade Radio Belgrade Network in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Ljubo Ljubisic report]

[Text] The situation in the Glina area is very critical. Both members of the Yugoslav People's Army and members of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Croatia are present in Glina. According to some reports, small numbers are already on the streets. Let us first hear a report by a Novi Sad correspondent Ljubo Ljubisic who is in (?Dvor na Uni) [Krajina region]:

[Ljubisic] (?Dvor na Uni) is a cursed place. There are barricades around Dvor and Dvor is completely blocked off. People expect members of the Croatian Ministry for Internal Affairs to carry out an attack. All people are keeping watch and are armed.

The Executive Council of the Dvor Assembly held an emergency session today and adopted several conclusions. An state of emergency has been introduced in the (?entire) territory of the commune of Dvor na Uni. All citizens of the Dvor commune that are ready to defend their hearths and families have been asked to immediately report with their arms to [word indistinct] and the militia stations of the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina. The command of the territorial defense and the secretariat for national defense of the Dvor na Uni

commune have been asked to carry out the full mobilization of the units of territorial defense of the Dvor na Uni commune. The military service has been asked to immediately distribute arms [words indistinct] and mobilize the territorial defense units of the Dvor na Uni commune.

People were informed that in Glina, a (?neighboring) commune, there are many wounded, injured, even dead. Members of the Croatian Ministry for Internal Affairs opened fire on citizens [words indistinct].

Dead, Injured Reported in Krajina Shooting

LD2606105291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1012 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Knin, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—The telephone lines with Glina and Dvor na Uni were down this morning and it is not certain what has happened in these municipalities, Milenko Zelembaba, head of the Knin police station, has said. However, according to Zelembaba, in these Krajina municipalities there was heavy gunfire up until 1000 today and there are dead and injured on both sides.

There is fear in Knin that such a situation could spread and lead to clashes on a larger scale. Zelembaba believes that the Croatian internal affairs forces will attempt incursions into those municipalities and Serbian territories which they consider "easy and soft targets."

Knin itself is peaceful following yesterday's decisions by the Croatian Assembly on the sovereignty of Croatia and the Slovene Assembly on independence, but tension and suspense can be felt, as well as the concern of the Serbian Population.

Soldiers Surround Kuzma Border Crossing, Withdraw

LD2606093691 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 0900 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Radio Slovenia has reported that at 0800 this morning an incident occurred at the international border crossing at Kuzma near Murska Sobota. Members of the Yugoslav Army surrounded the border crossing and demanded that the border post officials surrender their arms and leave the premises. The officials refused and the army stayed put. While the incident was in progress the border crossing functioned normally.

Radio Slovenia also reports that the head of the border police station tried to speak to the Yugoslav People's Army unit commander but that in the meantime the unit had withdrawn. It has also been learned that the commander of the Murska Sobota garrison has said that the unit that surrounded the border crossing was not from his garrison.

The Murska Sobota police department is conducting an investigation to identify the soldiers who surrounded the border crossing in Kuza.

Tanks Reportedly Heading for Glina, Croatia

LD2606100191 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 0900 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] At about 0300 this morning, a group of armed civilians and uniformed persons with insignia of the Krajina police attacked the Croatian Internal Affairs Ministry [MUP] police station in the center of Glina. According to reports from the Glina population there was gunfire from all directions. There is no official information about the number of wounded or possibly dead people. In the course of the morning four wounded people—two civilians and one MUP policeman [numbers as heard]—were admitted to a hospital in Sisak. The hospital staff told us that this morning, outside Glina, members of the Martic [Krajina police chief] units stopped two ambulances carrying wounded people, preventing them from going any further.

There were also overnight disturbances in Dvor na Uni. Armed civilians and uniformed persons with the same insignia attempted to attack the village of Struga populated by Croats. The attack was swiftly repelled. [passage indistinct]

A meeting is underway in the police department in Sisak, attended among others by Josko Moric, Croatian assistant minister of internal affairs. It is difficult to obtain any official information but at about 0730 this morning about 30 tanks and armored vehicles were seen leaving the grounds of Sisak garrison in the direction of Glina. According to the people of Glina the army has arrived and is now deployed in the town.

Belgrade, Zagreb Press Views Markovic Speech

LD2506141491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1132 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Belgrade, June 25 (TANJUG)—The Zagreb daily VJESNIK today writes that Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic came to Croatia on Monday 'with stands and ideas which are today much closer to the political platforms of the Republics of Croatia and Slovenia.'

In his address of the Croatian Parliament, Markovic opposed the unilateral proclamation of independence from Yugoslavia of the Republics of Croatia and Slovenia and urged a peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav political crisis, implementation of reforms, functioning of the existing system until new agreement should be reached on Yugoslavia's organization, convertibility of the dinar, faster privatization, and a single Yugoslav market.

The daily, published in Croatia's capital of Zagreb, criticizes Markovic for 'not having appeared with such an expose in the other republican parlients too, especially Serbian.'

The daily headlines reports from the Croatian parliament as 'Markovic under fire in parliament' and 'deputies do not trust Markovic.'

The Zagreb dailies VECERNJI LIST and ZAPAD carry reports from the republican parliament entitled 'Deja Vu' and 'Markovic's Speech Elicits a Sharp Retort,' respectively.

The Belgrade daily BORBA carries a text on Croatian parliamentary deputies' sharp attacks on Markovic under the heading 'Yugoslavia—A Phantom State,' and excerpts from the prime minister's address in a text entitled 'Weapons Do Not Bring Reform and Democracy.'

In an article entitled 'Theses About a Fictitious Yugoslavia,' the Belgrade daily POLITIKA joins the rest of the press in reporting on the sharp criticisms addressed to Markovic and Yugoslav Foreign Minister Budimir Loncar. The Croatian Parliament has asked that this latter be held accountable for his speech at the CSCE Berlin meeting.

The Belgrade daily VECERNJE NOVOSTI carries an article entitled 'Hatred as a Weapon Against Yugoslavia', in which it says that the Croatian Parliament has 'let loose an avalanche of insults and abuses.'

The Belgrade daily POLITIKA EKSPRES carries a text headlined 'Those Who Sow the Seeds of Hatred,' in which it says that the 'Croatian Parliament rejected Markovic's offer for a peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav political crisis.'

'Markovic's arguments are not convincing,' headlines the daily DELO its report. DELO, which appears in Ljubljana, Slovenia, says that the Croatian parliament even likened Markovic to Cervantes's Don Quixote.

The Sarajevo daily OSLOBODJENJE headlines its text 'Croats Do Not Recognize Federal Government's Measures' and writes that the Croatian parliament 'opened fire from all weapons on the federal prime minister, the policy of the federal government and the federal bodies in general.'

Loncar Attends Croatian Assembly, Meets Press

LD2506162991 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1230 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Excerpts] Dear listeners, here is your reporter from the Croatian Assembly, Andjelko Pericic. Today, during a noon recess of the Croatian Assembly, the foreign policy committee met with Federal Foreign Affairs secretary Budimir Loncar, discussed aspects of yesterday's discussion at a joint assembly session, which FEC President Ante Markovic addressed. At that session, several deputies sharply criticized Budimir Loncar's CSCE speech. The committee convened in connection with this, and Budimir Loncar explained some of his positions. [passage omitted]

Deputy Ante (?prhancin) asked Budimir Loncar directly why he failed to single out culprits for the situation in Yugoslavia when he was in Berlin. Budimir Loncar replied: [Begin Loncar recording] There was an agreement at the CSCE that speeches are five to six minutes long. I also had to comply with this agreement. I held that my speech was adequate, bearing in mind that I had to present, in five minutes, views on Yugoslavia: on all its known problems, differences, conflicts and the process of finding ways out of the crisis; as well as on world trends and, within this framework, the CSCE role. Today too, I hold that if you look carefully, you will see a very objective picture of the situation in Yugoslavia, which does not mean that it could not be widened and specified, if one had time and space for this.

Second, I believe that my Berlin speech should be viewed in connection with the declaration on Yugoslavia, because my speech was linked with it and was specifically aimed at it. These two documents are parts of a whole. I believe that the declaration is much more important. I think that it is an excellent declaration, that it expresses a well-intentioned approach to Yugoslavia, and that the CSCE, as a common body of all European countries taking care of security and cooperation, from these positions [words indistinct] with this declaration which could only have beneficial effects on further work in Yugoslavia. Looking from the other side, it represents an additional link, and a positive link, between the Yugoslav situation, crisis, and a wider context out of which Yugoslavia cannot and should not be taken. Thank you. [end recording]

Following this, foreign and domestic journalists asked numerous questions. For instance: "Did you reach some agreement at a session of the Croatian Assembly's Foreign Policy Committee?", "Are you going to represent Croatia and Yugoslavia in the same way in the future as you did before?", "Will you comment on a demand not to represent Croatia anymore?", "What will you undertake in connection with Slovenia and Croatia's intention to dissociate, if the world does not recognize them as international subjects?". Budimir Loncar made the following reply to the mentioned questions:

[Begin Loncar recording] First, whether we have made some agreement or whether we parted ways during the discussion. I would say that today's discussion was very useful, that it was conducted in a democratic, tolerant spirit, and I think that it was very useful. However, we have agreed that it would be desirable and beneficial to continue talks, especially about [words indistinct] and the role of our country.

Some asked how [words indistinct] declaration on independence, and Slovenia and Croatia's representation, and how this will influence the work of the federal administration, and especially the foreign affairs service. The Yugoslav Foreign Affairs Service will act in line with the existing costitutional regulations. Of course, the Foreign Affairs Service understands that Yugoslavia is in a phase of restructuring, and that it should be reconstituted, of course, within the framework of the existing

constitutional norms, and that Yugoslavia is facing inevitable changes. But the service cannot predict the entire future.

Finally, someone asked about a speech yesterday by Mr. Manolic, president of the Croatian Government. As a rule, I do not make comments on speeches made by someone who is absent, and now I do not want to comment on Mr. Manolic's speech, although I spent the whole night listening to the entire discussion in the Croatian Assembly. I would like someone to present a document enabling me to speak against any republic or any subject in Yugoslavia or abroad, or against an individual. I, however, have many documents in which representatives of one republic speak against others. Finally, I would like to thank the chairman of the Croatian Assembly's Foreign Policy Committee and all honored deputies who took part in the discussion, for our dialogue and a very pleasant and useful morning, at least for me, [words indistinct]

Let me say in public that I have nothing against it if the committee chairman, with the approval of other participants in the discussion, decides to publish the minutes from the session. But, the complete minutes, please, otherwise I shall not approve them, unless it is published from the very beginning to end. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Croatian TV Reports Shots Fired in Kozibrod

LD2506211691 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1934 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Summary] Zagreb, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—Over 10 members of Martic's police together with a group of Serbian nationals this morning blocked all approaches to Dvor-na-Uni where a few militiamen who are Serbian nationals and who had been working for the Croatian Ministry of Internal Affairs joined the Krajina militia and are now patrolling the town together with Martic's milita. This was reported by Croatian TV tonight in its "Croatia Today" program.

Djuro Brodarac, police administration head in Sisak, has informed journalists that several hundred Serbian nationals gathered last night and during the night in Dvor-na-Uni. They were getting ready to attack the new police station in the community of Kozibrod, where the Croatian people are in a majority.

Brodarac also said that shortly after midnight last night, people tried to cross the Una River in a boat and enter Kozibrod; but after warning shots were fired, they went back. Shots were also fired in Divusa, where the population is also predominantly Croatian. The attack was on the police patrol from Kozibrod.

Croatia Recognizes Federal Army as Interim Force

LD2506165191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1409 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—"Until there is an agreement on issues of common defense within the alliance of sovereign republics, in other words, until its own armed forces are installed and no more than three years from now, as an interim measure the Republic of Croatia will recognize the Yugoslav People's Army as the common armed force of all the republics comprising Yugoslavia."

This is stressed in the draft constitutional decision embarking on dissociation of the Republic of Croatia from the SFRY and association into an alliance of sovereign republics. The draft was presented and explained today in the Croatian Assembly by Ivica Racan, president of the Party of Democratic Change [Stranka Demokratskih Promena—SDP] on behalf of the club of SDP deputies. The draft stresses that "the Yugoslav People's Army will be unable to undertake activities beyond those necessary for maintaining its combat readiness on the territory of the Republic of Croatia without permission of either the Assembly or the president of the Republic of Croatia. In addition "the Republic of Croatia will not recognize the competence of the military courts and the military public prosecutor on its territory unless approved either by the Supreme Court or the public prosecutor of the Republic of Croatia," the SDP stresses in its draft, to be considered today by the Assembly's Constitutional Commission.

In addition, the draft declaration on the sovereignty and autonomy of the Republic of Croatia, submitted to the Assembly by a working group responsible for drawing up fundamental state-law decisions, also states that "all the issues that cannot be resolved now, such as the Yugoslav's People's Army position, will be resolved through a negotiated agreement between the Republic of Croatia, other federal units, and the SFRY in the process of dissociation."

Army 'Cannot Operate' in Croatia

LD2506124491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1214 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 25 June (TANJUG)—At a news conference today, Slovene Defense Minister Janez Jansa stressed that Slovenia has the shortest period of military service in Europe.

Asked "will Slovenia be ready to help Croatia if, after the process of the independence [osamostaljivanje] of this republic, the Army reacts," Jansa said that the Territorial Defense of Slovenia, on the basis of accepted laws, can be used only on the territory of the Republic of Slovenia. The Territorial Defense of Slovenia cannot operate on territory of the Republic of Croatia, but,

according to Jansa, they can be helped by the exchange of information "and in the area of the coordination of certain activities."

Croatian Assembly Recognizes Slovenia

LD2606105491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1042 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Zagreb, 26 Jun (TANJUG)—At the proposal of Croatian President Franjo Tudjman and on the basis of Article 70 of the republican constitution, at midday today all three chambers of the Croatian Assembly, in separate sessions, adopted a decision on the recognition of the Republic of Slovenia.

"The Republic of Croatia, as a sovereign and independent state, recognizes the Republic of Slovenia as a sovereign and independent state" is the only text of the decision, which was signed by the presidents of the three chambers and by Assembly President Zarko Domljan.

TANJUG Explains Slovene Independence Acts

AU2606082791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1950 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, Jun 25 (TANJUG)—By a majority of votes the Parliament of the Republic of Slovenia on Tuesday night adopted a fundamental constitutional document on independence of the Republic of Slovenia.

A total of 180 deputies voted in favor, two were against and there were 12 who abstained.

According to the fundamental document, Slovenia is an independent state and is taking over the rights and duties which, as set out in the republican and the federal constitutions, were the competence of the Yugoslav organs.

This northwestern republic no longer recognizes federal legislation, while Slovenia's state borders are those internationally-recognized state borders of Yugoslavia with Austria, Italy and Hungary as well as the border between the Republic of Slovenia and Croatia, as set out in the document.

Slovenia was ready as an independent state in the future to discuss institutionalized and other links with other republics.

Slovenia's parliament on Tuesday night adopted also the "declaration on independence" as well as the constitutional law on the implementation of the fundamental document.

The declaration expresses readiness to immediately resume talks on the possible forms of association with the states which will emerge on the territory of Yugoslavia.

The joint session of all three parliament chambers was attended by Austrian Consul-General Juta Stefan Bastl and Hungarian Consul-General Gabor Gabi, as well as representatives of the Slovene organizations from Austria and Italy.

In the meantime, the federal parliament in Belgrade on Tuesday night rejected the statement on disassociation of the Slovene parliament as a one-sided and unacceptable act. It was demanded of the federal government and other institutions to undertake all the necessary measures to prevent the re-tailoring of Yugoslavia and to protect its integrity.

Slovene Leaders On Immediate Independence Tasks

AU2606075291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2123 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, Jun 25 (TANJUG) - "As of today, Slovenia as a sovereign state will launch also the procedure for its international recognition," said Slovene Presidency President Milan Kucan on Tuesday night in the Slovene parliament in Ljubljana.

Speaking on the occasion of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Slovenia, Kucan said that these decisions would enable the republic to address the governments of other states to ask them to recognize it as an independent and sovereign state, and would also request admission to the United Nations, the Council of Europe and other international organizations.

"In keeping with the provisions of the Helsinki Charter, Slovenia recognizes the borders of all states in Europe as inviolable, which means its own borders too," said Kucan.

The Slovene president proposed to the parliament to already on Tuesday night recognize independent Republic of Croatia.

Speaking about the tasks of the parliament after gaining independence, Kucan warned that the focus of attention should be shifted to the strained economic and social questions. Otherwise, he said, "all our efforts toward a sovereign state of our own would have neither the right meaning nor justification."

Referring to the possibility of forming a community of sovereign states on the territory of Yugoslavia, the Slovene president set out that new states which emerge though disassociation of Yugoslavia were sovereign and had all the powers on their territory within the existing borders of the republics as they were so far.

The government of Slovenia has prepared, and the parliament adopted fundamental legislation affirming the independence of the Republic of Slovenia, said Slovene Premier Lojze Peterle.

He singled out as important the laws regulating the monetary system, the system of economic relations with foreign countries and the fiscal system.

The Slovene government has opted for a gradual realization of monetary autonomy, said Peterle, adding that in the transitional period the dinar will continue to be in use in Slovenia.

"Over the past few days, we have gradually increased the readiness of the expert organs and services and certain defense forces so that they stand ready to protect our decision," said Peterle, pointing up Slovenia's wish to continue with talks on ordering all the yet unresolved questions in the area of defense.

In conclusion, Slovene parliament President France Bucar, emphasized that Slovenia's present step was logical and unavoidable, because had Slovenia not taken it "it would have condemned itself to disappearance."

Regarding accusations that Slovenia was breaking up Yugoslavia, Bucar said that this could be taken "that Slovenia was helping to remove such a state creation as has in its essence been an element of unstableness and conflicts."

Slovenia to Seek International Recognition

LD2506173291 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1656 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, 25 Jun (TANJUG)—As of today, Slovenia as a sovereign state will set in motion the procedure to gain international recognition, said Milan Kucan, president of the Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia, addressing a joint session of all three chambers of the Assembly of the Republic of Croatia in connection with the proclamation of the autonomy and independence [samostalnost and nezavisnost] of the Republic of Slovenia. According to him, the decisions adopted by the Republic's assembly today will enable Slovenia to approach the governments of other states with the request to be recognized as an independent and sovereign state, and to establish diplomatic relations with it. At the same time, Slovenia will apply for membership in the United Nations, the Council of Europe, and other international organizations.

Kucan: Talks Possible After Independence

AU2506131391 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1100 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] At the news conference held in the Ljubljana Cankar Hall this morning, Slovene President Milan Kucan answered questions by journalists, most of them foreign. He said that even after its independence, Slovenia is ready for negotiations with other parts of Yugoslavia and that it has already stated this clearly.

Slovenia will negotiate above all about three groups of issues: mutual obligations and rights, taking over the executive functions that were transferred to the Federation in the past, and future association on the territory of the Yugoslav republics.

According to Kucan, the rejection of Slovene independence on the part of the international community has surprised only those who were taken in by some party leaders' statements that Slovenia would be recognized two weeks after independence at the latest. Economic relations will fortunately not be cut.

Milan Kucan expressed the hope that the border crossings between Croatia and Slovenia will receive travelers with signs of welcome, above all with raised barriers, because states have to have borders even if they are open.

The president of the Slovene Presidency assessed at the news conference that any resemblance with events in the Soviet Union is only slight, because there the danger to the world is represented by more than 5,000 nuclear warheads which—because of the disorder—could easily be controlled by unsuitable people.

In reply to a question whether he feels guilty being a member of the party responsible for the ideologization of the country in the past, Milan Kucan said that he was a representative of that wing of the League of Communists that advocated change and a deviation from the ideologized state.

Bucar, Peterle Hold News Conference

AU2406173291 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 24 June 91 1330 GMT

[Gojko Brvar and Sonja Znidarsic report]

[Text] A string of news conferences at which Slovene officials have been explaining their stands regarding the declaration of our independence have been held in the Cankar Hall since last Friday.

Two such meetings—Prime Minister Peterle's and Republican Assembly President Dr. Bucar's—with journalists took place today. Gojko Brvar reports that we will remember Dr. Bucar's news conference because of its highly rational approach to the events relating to independence:

[Brvar] Dr. France Bucar had to conclude that the international community does not support this Slovene step and that in the future—until pragmatism prevails—we will have to cope with the situation. Luckily, it does not appear that the economic and financial relations with foreign partners will be broken; therefore, the price should not be too high. We encounter the scarce knowledge of foreign diplomacies that oversee the fact that Slovenia's remaining in Yugoslavia would not make a flashpoint disappear, because Yugoslavia in the present form is a flashpoint.

Dr. Bucar repeated several times that Slovene independence does not mean breaking all links with the Yugoslav community, but rather a legal regulation of a state in which all parts of Yugoslavia would talk about the future as independent and equal partners. Quite a few matters

will remain under the supervision of the federal institutions, although now under certain conditions. Instead of the delegation in the SFRY Federal Chamber, we will have a Slovene negotiating group with the same number of members, whose decisions will always have to be endorsed by the Slovene Assembly as well.

The federal Army, for which Dr. Bucar said that it behaves very rationally and soberly, will remain in Slovenia until 1993, under conditions determined in the negotiations, although we do not exclude the possibility that one day we might decide in favor of a joint federal army, established according to new principles.

In reply to a question by THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent, Dr. Bucar said that Ante Markovic has no other tool in his hands to prevent the proclamation of Slovenia's independence except for force, which Europe would not approve of.

In the monetary sphere, keeping the dinar as the means of payment represents the most vulnerable point of Slovene independence according to Dr. Bucar, but a new Slovene monetary unit could be obtained only after the reconstruction of the economy, otherwise we would deal with worthless paper instead of money.

Regarding guest workers, Dr. Bucar said that those who permanently reside in Slovenia have a right to automatically obtain Slovene citizenship, as soon as they ask for it. Otherwise they will have the same rights as guest workers in Europe. Regarding these workers receiving the status of an ethnic minority, Dr. Bucar said that we only recognize indigenous minorities, and not emigres. When POLITIKA journalists asked about the status of Serbs in Bela Krajina, Dr. Bucar replied that if they had requested it, the Assembly would have discussed this issue, but such a demand had not been forthcoming—quite the opposite.

So much for the news conference by Dr. France Bucar, president of the Slovene Assembly. Lojze Peterle, president of the Slovene Executive Council, met with domestic and foreign journalists in Cankar Hall today and answered many questions. Sonja Znidarsic reports:

[Znidarsic] We have before us the final step, by which the Republican Assembly will formally proclaim an independent state. Thirteen independence laws have been adopted but, in Peterle's words, we will have to tackle the issues of army, diplomacy, and monetary politics gradually. With independence, Slovenia will obtain a legal basis for a new agreement with Yugoslavia. We hope, the prime minister said, that once independence is proclaimed there will be more understanding and readiness for it than so far.

When asked to comment on the EEC stands and Loncar's behavior within the CSCE, Lojze Peterle replied that the Declaration of the European Parliament, which envisaged that nations have a right to decide by themselves about themselves and their future, is of prime importance for us.

Regarding Loncar's behavior in Berlin and his assessment, that is to say, warning on what will happen if Slovenia and Croatia secede, the prime minister categorically stated that the foreign minister spoke on Slovenia's behalf without being authorized to do so.

When asked what documents the legislature will adopt today, he replied they will discuss the Constitutional Act on Slovenia's Independence, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitutional Law. What will happen with Slovene cadres in the Federation? Peterle replied that from now on Slovenia will not have a delegation in the Federal Chamber, but a 12-member group that will perform duties connected with disassociation. Dr. Drnovsek will remain the SFRY Presidency member, people in the Federal Executive Council will remain if they wished to settle questions arising from bankruptcy proceedings.

A BBC journalist wondered whether the Slovenes have acted hastily with dissociation, because they do not have their own money, passports, or state symbols. Peterle expressed hope that the question of symbols will be resolved today. Everything is ready for passports, and the solution to keep the dinar is temporary.

When asked about international recognition of Slovenia, in particular by Austria—which initially displayed far more enthusiasm than now, when it is aligning its stands with those of Italy and Hungary—Lojze Peterle replied that he does not doubt that it is in Austria's interest to have good relations with its southern neighbor. When additionally asked by a Klagenfurt journalist whether this could be Yugoslavia, the prime minister replied that Austria borders on Slovenia.

Bucar Terms Federal Reaction 'Neurotic'

AU2606080491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0625 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, Jun 26 (TANJUG)—President of the Slovene parliament France Bucar said in Ljubljana last night that the reaction of the federal authorities and the Federal Chamber of the Yugoslav assembly were "irrational and neurotic" and bore evidence that the federal bodies had no strategy with which to counter the moves made by the northwestern republic.

The Yugoslav parliament's Federal Chamber refused in Belgrade last night to negotiate with Slovenia on its disassociation from Yugoslavia and rejected as illegitimate the decision of the republican parliament to proclaim Slovenia an independent and sovereign state.

Asked at a press conference a direct question about the character of the Slovene parliament's decision—whether it was a unilateral act of secession or an act of disassociation—Bucar replied that this was a "very complex question. Disassociation necessitates at least two negotiating sides, but the other side had not shown a disposition to do this."

The president of the Slovene parliament said he doubted if the Yugoslav People's Army might decide to intervene, but did not rule out that possibility.

Asked if Yugoslavia still existed, Bucar replied that Slovenia's documents clearly said that there was no longer any continuity with Yugoslavia. "Neither the federal government nor the other federal bodies can any longer be recognized. The remnant can no longer act in the name of Yugoslavia, as that state and its organs have ceased to exist," Bucar said.

According to Bucar, the Assembly of Slovenia yesterday authorized member of the Presidency of Yugoslavia from Slovenia Janez Drnovsek to participate in the work of the Presidency, but only in his capacity as an officer of Slovenia. "Of course, it is up to the other side to accept him in this capacity," Bucar said.

Slovene Vice-Premier Andrej Ocvirk told the press that Slovenia would oppose the federal government's measures against the republic's independence.

Ocvirk and Bucar stressed that the federal government had not been ready to negotiate with the Republic of Slovenia and accept its arguments.

Bucar Sends Congratulations to Croatia

LD2506213591 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2000 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] In connection with the proclamation of the independence and autonomy of the state of the Republic of Croatia, Dr. France Bucar, president of the assembly of the Republic of Slovenia, has sent a telegram of congratulations to Dr. Zarko Domljan, president of the Croatian Sabor [assembly]. The telegram says, among other things: I wish that the decision taken by the friendly neighboring country may contribute to further fruitful reciprocal cooperation in the spirit of respect for the highest values of European and world democracy, for the sake of progress and prosperity of our citizens and for the inclusion of the independent states in present-day European ties and also in a possible new community of sovereign states on the territory of what so far has been the SFRY.

Dr. France Bucar also said: Convey this message of greetings to the Sabor deputies and to the citizens of friendly Croatia.

Slovene Paper on Markovic's Speech

LD2506140291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1206 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Maribor, June 25 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic's address to the parliament of the Republic of Croatia was a distressful occasion, although many would not admit it, writes the daily VECER, published in Maribor, Republic of Slovenia.

'It is probably clear by now that the position of Croatia is not the same as that of Slovenia,' says VECER.

The paper points out that Croatia's dissociation would be no dissociate from Yugoslavia but that all those who have been promised this would believe that it has dissociated.

The paper points out that Croatian President Franjo Tudjman has probably invited the federal prime minister to the Croatian Parliament also because he finds it difficult to fulfill all the expectations concerning the republics independence and the speed of the process which he [word indistinct].

The paper sees the fact that Markovic and his assistants left the Croatian Parliament with the deputies expressing respect as a possibility that Markovic's arguments bear significance 'despite political disagreements and all past follies' in Yugoslavia.

Slovene Officials Clarify Army Role, Customs

LD2506182591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1329 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana 25 Jun (TANJUG)—The Slovene Territorial Defense can be used only on that republic's territory. During a news conference today, Republican Secretary Janez Jansa gave this answer when asked if Slovenia would be prepared to help Croatia in the event of Army intervention after this republic becomes independent.

Asked what will happen with active service and civilian Army personnel in Slovenia after 26 June, Jansa replied that the conditions under which Slovenia is ready to resolve the military issues have been defined. According to Jansa, these people, as well as retired military personnel in Slovenia, have been guaranteed all social rights.

In the area of demilitarization, Slovenia in one year has done more than other European countries in 10 years, he said. Jansa stressed that the length of the military service in Slovenia is the shortest in Europe. He said the Slovene Territorial Defense has about 70,000 members. They are primarily reserve members. Members on active duty are only stationed in headquarters, while 300 men are trained in training centers.

Igor Bavcar, the republican secretary for internal affairs, was asked how citizens of other republics will pay custom duties at Slovene border posts. Bavcar said he was not responsible for this area, but there is no reason why custom duty on goods not meant for Slovenia should be paid to this republic.

FEC Orders Collection of Customs From Slovenia

LD2506223291 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2000 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] The federal government has ordered the Federal Customs Administration to start consistently implementing the Markovic cabinet's decisions on ensuring that the Republic of Slovenia pays customs dues and

other import duties into the federal budget. The federal secretary of information has reported that the decision will become effective at midnight tonight [2200 GMT] because the Republic of Slovenia has not fulfilled the conditions of the recent agreement concerning the payment of customs dues and import duties signed by the representatives of both governments on 20 June.

DELO: World 'Pushing Slovenia Back Home'

LD2506165791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1544 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Ljubljana, June 25 (TANJUG)—The Ljubljana daily DELO writes today that "the European Twelve" and the United States have "indirectly made it clear that they are prepared to talk of an independent state of Slovenia in the event that its independence results from an agreement with former partners and federal organs."

DELO, which is close to the government of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia, says that "the world is pushing Slovenia back home, into a wrecked house, in which an agreement is to be achieved on how a feuding family is going to go its way and what is going to be the basis of its future relations."

"It only remains for us to learn this lesson from real politics and instead of political platitudes for daily (above all) internal use, start looking at facts," writes DELO.

Gligorov Views Slovene, Croatian 'Secession'

LD2606113491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1102 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Ohrid, June 26 (TANJUG)—President of Yugoslavia's Republic of Macedonia Kiro Gligorov said today that the Yugoslav Republics should not seek a way out of the crisis in unilateral acts.

Addressing a medical congress in the border town of Ohrid, Gligorov said that Slovenia's and Croatia's secession was a result of deteriorated inter-ethnic and inter-republican relations.

He said that it was impermissible that lives had been lost in the country and that fear and uncertainty were spreading, threatening to produce catastrophic results, and appealed for sanity, democratic dialogue and a rational approach in the quest for a way out of the very complex and critical situation.

Macedonia remains on its platform concerning Yugoslavia's future system as it has proposed together with Bosnia-Hercegovina, said Gligorov. 'The platform has won broad support in the country, and has also been accepted by the international community as a realistic approach to preserving Yugoslavia as an alliance of sovereign states and maintaining peace in the country', he added.

The compromise solution envisages for the republics to be sovereign, with the key areas of economic relations, foreign policy, defence and human rights regulated at the federal level.

Krajina President Comments on Croatian Secession

LD2606053491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0059 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Knin, June 25 (TANJUG)—President of the Executive Council of the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina (SAO Krajina) Milan Babic said on Tuesday evening that the "Croatian parliament's decision to constitute a sovereign Republic of Croatia is the sovereign right of the Croatian people but also a unilateral act from the point of view of other peoples and the Yugoslav state."

The Croatian authorities do not recognise SAO Krajina, which was proclaimed by Serbs in Croatia following the adoption of that republic's new Constitution last December because they have lost in this second largest Yugoslav republic the status of a nation which has a state.

Babic pointed out in an interview to TANJUG that the Croatian parliament's decision "can relate only to ethnic territories of the Croatian people, but not by any means to Serbian territories."

"Any act by the Republic of Croatia towards taking the territories of SAO Krajina or any other part of the Serbian ethnic territory will constitute an act of aggression which may have fatal consequences for the aggressor alone, and many deny the Croatian people a historic opportunity to found their own sovereign, national state," said Babic.

Meanwhile, a Serbian People's Assembly formed on Tuesday evening in Borovo, eastern Croatia, decided that Croatian regions of Slavonija, Baranja and Srem would remain part of Yugoslavia, it was announced.

Slavonija, Baranja and western Srem will continue to observe the federal Constitution, federal laws and regulations which are not contrary to the country's Constitution, says the decision.